

The
Church of England Pulpit,



AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

283.05
CHUO
v. 25



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

THE
Church of England Pulpit,

AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.



JANUARY TO JUNE, 1888.

VOL. XXV.

LONDON:

"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160, FLEET STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXV.

SERMONS ON :—

PAGE

The Birthday of Human Greatness—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ...	1
Man's Retrospect of God's Mercy—By Rev. Joseph Maskell ...	6
Patience in Work—By Professor T. G. Bonney, D.Sc., LL.D. ...	13
Mankind—The Past, the Present, and the Future—By Rev. Harris Davies, M.A. ...	16
The Dawn and the Day Star—By Rev. Philip Dwyer, M.A. ...	25
The Treasure in Earthen Vessels—By late Rev. Edward Meade ...	29
The Divine Similitude in Man—By Rev. Charles Richard Panter, M.A., LL.D. ...	37
Ruth—Sympathy—By Rev. Christopher Wordsworth ...	40
The Sinlessness of the Flesh—By Rev. Canon Scott-Holland, D.D. ...	49
Forgetting the Past—By Rev. G. Jannings, M.A. ...	52
Perfect Peace—By Bishop of Chester ...	61
Samuel, the Last Judge—By Rev. Benjamin Hunter, B.A. ...	64
New Year's Thoughts for Soldiers—By Bishop W. Pakenham Walsh, D.D. ...	73
The Duty of Parents—By Rev. J. P. Sandlands, M.A. ...	74
Their Net Brake—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. ...	77
The Great Voice from Heaven—By Rev. J. Lightfoot, M.A., D.Sc. ...	85
The New Heaven and New Earth—By Rev. E. Herbert Jones, M.A. ...	87
Failing of the Grace of God—By late Rev. Edward Meade ...	89
The Confessions of Solomon—By Rev. J. J. Stewart-Perowne, D.D. ...	97
The Gift of God—By Venerable William E. Meade, D.D. ...	109
Regeneration and Conversion—By Rev. Aubrey L. Moore, M.A. ...	111
Preparation for Eternity—By Rev. Charles Richard Panter, M.A., LL.D. ...	121
The Uses of Temptation—By Bishop of Carlisle ...	133
The Touchstone of Christianity—By Bishop of Peterborough ...	145
Narrowness—By Very Rev. Herbert Armitage James, B.D. ...	157
Anything but the <i>One</i> Thing—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. ...	161
Profanity—By Rev. James Hamilton, M.A. ...	169
Death of the German Emperor—By Rev. C. B. Brigstocke, M.A. ...	171
The Future State Indicated by the Resurrection of Body—By Rev. L. R. Rawnsley, B.A. ...	181

SERMONS ON :—

PAGE

Israel in Egypt—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ...	193
Repentance—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. ...	205
An Eastertide Sermon—By Rev. H. Heber Evans, B.A. ...	207
The Necessity and Reasonableness of Sacrifice and Mediation—By Rev. Charles Richard Panter, M.A., LL.D. ...	217
Christianity without Christ—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. ...	220
The Church of Ireland—By Right Rev. Bishop Pakenham Walsh, D.D. ...	229
The Body in the Christian Religion—By Rev. Dr. Paget ...	241
Notes for Children's Sermon—By Rev. H. G. Rose-dale ...	245, 293
The Sympathy of Christ—By Rev. J. Paterson Smyth, B.D. ...	253
My Brother's Keeper—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ...	265
The True Vine—By Bishop of Colombo ...	277
Inauguration of Joshua's Leadership—By Rev. Benjamin Hunter, B.A. ...	280
The Uses of Prayer—By Venerable Edwin Palmer, D.D. ...	289
The Gospel for the First Century, the Gospel for the Nineteenth—By Rev. James A. Carr, M.A., LL.D. ...	292
Emotion in Religion—By Rev. Robert Eyton, M.A. ...	301
Nebuchadnezzar and the Three Children—By Rev. William Alnwick ...	303

SERMONS BY :—

Bishop of Carlisle—The Uses of Temptation ...	133
Bishop of Chester—Perfect Peace ...	61
Bishop of Peterborough—The Touchstone of Christianity ...	145
Bishop of Colombo—The True Vine ...	277
Bishop W. Pakenham Walsh, D.D.—New Year's Thoughts for Soldiers ...	73
Bishop W. Pakenham Walsh, D.D.—The Church of Ireland ...	229
Alnwick, Rev. William—Nebuchadnezzar and the Three Children ...	303
Brigstocke, Rev. C. B., M.A.—Death of the German Emperor ...	171
Bonney, Professor T. G., LL.D.—Patience in Work ...	13
Carr, Rev. James A., M.A., LL.D.—The Gospel for the First Century, the Gospel for the Nineteenth ...	292
Davies, Rev. Harris, M.A.—Mankind—The Past, the Present, and the Future ...	16
Dwyer, Rev. Philip, M.A.—The Dawn and the Day Star ...	25

283 05
0400
V. 25

SERMONS BY:—

PAGE

Evans, Rev. H. Heber, B.A.—An Eastertide Sermon	207
Eyton, Rev. Robert, M.A.—Emotion in Religion	301
Hamilton, Rev. James, M.A.—Profanity	169
Hunter, Rev. Benjamin, B.A.—Inauguration of Joshua's Leadership	280
Hunter, Rev. Benjamin, B.A.—Samuel, the Last Judge	64
James, Very Rev. Herbert Armitage, B.D.—Narrowness	157
Jannings, Rev. G., M.A.—Forgetting the Past	52
Jones, Rev. E. Herbert, M.A.—The New Heaven and New Earth	87
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—Their Net Brake	77
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—Anything but the One Thing	161
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—Repentance	205
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—Christianity without Christ	220
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Birthday of Human Greatness	1
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—Israel in Egypt	193
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—My Brother's Keeper	265
Lightfoot, Rev. J., M.A., D.Sc.—The Great Voice from Heaven	85
Maskell, Rev. Joseph—Man's Retrospect of God's Mercy	6
Meade, late Rev. Edward—The Treasure in Earthen Vessels	29
Meade, late Rev. Edward—Failing of the Grace of God	89
Meade, Venerable William E., D.D.—The Gift of God	109
Moore, Rev. Aubrey, M.A.—Regeneration and Conversion	111
Paget, Rev. Dr.—The Body in the Christian Religion	241
Palmer, Venerable Edwin, D.D.—The Uses of Prayer	289
Panter, Rev. Charles Richard, M.A., LL.D.—The Divine Similitude in Man	37
Panter, Rev. Charles Richard, M.A., LL.D.—Preparation for Eternity	121
Panter, Rev. Charles Richard, M.A., LL.D.—The Necessity and Reasonableness of Sacrifice and Mediation	217
Rawnsley, Rev. L. R., B.A.—The Future State Indicated by the Resurrection of Body	181
Rosedale, Rev. H. G.—Notes for Children's Sermon	245, 293
Sandlands, Rev. J. P., M.A.—The Duty of Parents	74
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Sinlessness of the Flesh	49
Stewart-Perowne, Very Rev. J. J., D.D.—The Confessions of Solomon	97
Smyth, Rev. J. Paterson, B.D.—The Sympathy of Christ	253
Wordsworth, Rev. Christopher—Ruth—Sympathy	40

LEADING ARTICLE:—

The Higher Education of Women	9
Irish Church Prospects in 1888	19, 32
Glebe Lands	31
Our Cathedrals	43
Welsh Nonconformity and the Church	55
The Peace-Loving Mennonites	67
Darwinism and the Christian Faith	80, 91, 101
Funeral Reform	102
Practical Statesmen on Armaments	115
"I am the Living Bread which came down from Heaven"	128
Prudential Assurance Company	129
The Oaths Bill	137
Religion and Art	150
The Restoration of Liberty	164

LEADING ARTICLES:—

PAGE

The Tithe-Rent Charge Bills	174, 198
More Bishops	185
A Scene in the Dublin Synod	199
The Papal Decree	211
The Decalogue: Its Authority in Ireland	211
The Pope's Censure	224
The Ten Commandments as Observed in England	225
The Pope and the Plan	233
The "Pulpit"	246
Is an Irish Schism a Ridiculous Bogy?	247
The Pan-Anglican Synod	259
If you wish Peace prepare for Peace	271
What are the Socialistic Aspects of the Irish Situation?	282
Missionary Brotherhoods	294
The Invincible Armada	307

EDITORIAL NOTES	260, 285, 297
-----------------	---------------

PAPERS:—

The Church and the Churches—By Rev. Brownlow Maitland	20, 33
A Few Words on the Question of Tithe-Rent Charge—By A Layman	44
Memorial to the late Archbishop Trench	45
The Geraldines—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, B.D.	81, 93, 116
The late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin	103
Give us this Day our Daily Bread—By Rev. F. Tilney Bassett, M.A.	124
The Church of St. Patrick—Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, B.D.	138, 175, 187, 200, 212, 234, 248
Fragmentary Thoughts of Orthodoxy	199
Recollections of a Parish Priest	267, 271
Our Christian Year	285, 297, 311
The Institution of the Eucharist—By Rev. Prebendary Bassett, M.A.	295, 310

CORRESPONDENCE:—

Parties in the Revision Synod	10, 23, 34
Meaning of Words of Administration	11
The Burning Bush—A Type of What?	11
Funeral Reform	22, 107
The Epiphany Collect	23
The Irish and the Welsh Church	35
Between Two Stools	46
Beware of <i>Odium Theologicum</i>	46, 57
St. John vi. 58	58, 70
The Church and the Churches	58
Where is Honesty to be Found?	69
The Bread which came down from Heaven	83, 94, 105, 130
Darwinism	95
"Attack the Town from the other side."—Lord Wellington at Badajos	95
Evolution	104, 142, 151, 165
A Sad Case	106
Is the Second Commandment Virtually Repealed?	117
Transubstantiation—A Passage of Arms between Dr. Littledale and the Catholic Press	118, 179, 202, 213
Regeneration and Conversion	129, 142, 152
Emphasis	130
The late Provost—The Blot in the Revision Report	131, 139, 152
Guard the Pass!	140
"The Outward and Spiritual Sign of an Inward and Spiritual Grace given unto us"	141
Banns of Marriage—A Scene!	143, 153
Bishop Andrewes on <i>Cadaver</i>	153
The Incarnation	154
Mr. Lawrence on Means and Vehicle	167
The Kildare Proteus	178
St. Paul: The Author of the Acts of the Apostles and the Third Gospel	187

CORRESPONDENCE :—

PAGE

The New Question and Answer Controversy	189, 202
1 Corinthians x. 16	189
Jacob's Fraud	189, 203, 214, 226, 250, 262
This is My Body	191
Transubstantiation and the Mass	201
Dr. King's Professorship at Dublin	214
A Scene in the Dublin Synod	215, 286, 311
The Authorship of the Acts of the Apostles	226
Preaching	237
Confession	237
"B's" Assaults!—Dr. Littledale	238
Church Army	250
St. John : The Author of the Fourth Gospel	250, 264
Robert Ellesmere	263
Science and Religion	274
The Gift of Tongues	275
Future Retribution	286, 299
Corporal Presence	286
Mr. Lawrence's Letter	299
Black Rubric	300
Psychology	319

POETRY :—

Safety (Joseph John Murphy)	71
The Potter and the Clay (Joseph John Murphy)	107
Christ in Heaven (Joseph John Murphy)	264
The Invincible Armada (Joseph John Murphy)	311

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"The First Epistle to Timothy"—By A. Rowland, LL.B., B.A.	12
"The British and Foreign Evangelical Review"	36, 203
"The Expositor"	46, 154, 167, 215, 275
Raphael Ben Isaac, a Tale of A.D. 20—By John Bradshaw	58
"Ready." Miss Robinson's Monthly Magazine	59
"The Theological Educator"	70
"Hand and Heart"—By Rev. C. Bullock, B.D.	131
"The Fireside"—By Rev. C. Bullock, B.D.	131
"Home Words"—By Rev. C. Bullock, B.D.	131
"The Day of Days"—By Rev. C. Bullock, B.D.	131
"Song of Cheer for Hours of Pain"—By Rev. C. Bullock, B.D.	131
"Stories on the Collects"—By C. A. Jones and Rev. S. G. Lines	131
"Thoughts for Church Seasons"—By Rev. Daniel Moore, M.A.	154
"The Power of the Church in the World"—By Rev T. Vevers Morley (Sch.), B.A.	155
"The Sermon Bible"	191
"Expositions"—By Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D.	191
"A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament"—By George Salmon, D.D., F.R.S.	215
"Confession"	227
"St. John : The Author of the Fourth Gospel"—By Howard Heber Evans, B.A.	238
"Tench White's Organ Library Book"	252
"The Pope in Politics : Great Speech of Father McGlynn in New York"	252

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

PAGE

"The Voice of the Year"—By A. S. Lamb	276
"The Loving Sacrifice"	287
"Reminiscences of William Rogers, Rector of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate"—Compiled by Rev. R. H. Haddon	287
"Democratic Vistas"—By Walt Whitman	299
"By God's Help"—Church of England Temperance Society	299

MISCELLANEOUS :—

The Ulsthorpe's Charity, St. Bride's Parish	9
The Suffragan Bishop of London, Dr. Earle	18
Burial Service Conducted by a Dissenting Minister in Church	39
Professor Paterson on Peace	47
Prebendary Grier	47
Doctor Profundus's Tomb	48
Robinson & Cleaver's Gift of Linen to the Queen	59
Cambridge College Missions	59
Funeral Reform Association	60, 71, 83
St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society	60
Archbishop Tait's Comment on Gladstone	66
The Scripture Readers' Association	72
Mission for the University of Cambridge	81
The New Organist to St. Paul's Cathedral	82
The Church Missionary Society	83
Sunday Evening Lectures at Cambridge	83
The late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin	114
Real Christianity by Herr Cohen	119
Defence of the Church in Wales	120
Bishop of Rochester on Organ Recitals	127
Testimonial to Rev. A. Jordan, M.A.	132
Memorial to the late Bishop of Manchester	137
The Economist on proposed 5 per cent. reduction on the Tithe-rent Charge	144
The late Albert Harford Pearson	155
The Rev. J. J. Puleine, Suffragan Bishop of Ripon	156
Church of England Temperance Society	168
The Deanery of Jersey	173
The Editor of the <i>Speaker's Commentary</i>	197
The Doré Gallery	210
<i>In Memoriam</i> —Rev. Charles Mackenzie	228
The Bishop of Salisbury on the State of his Diocese	239
The London Samaritan Society's New Home at Sandgate	268
History of the Church	298
The Tithe War in Wales	298
Missionary Intelligence	298

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS	12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312
------------------------------	--

CLERICAL OBITUARY	12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312
-------------------	--

The Church of England Pulpit

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XXV.—No. 628.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1888.

PRICE TWOPENCE.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE BIRTHDAY OF HUMAN GREATNESS.

BY CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED AT ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, ON
THE AFTERNOON OF CHRISTMAS DAY.

"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us."—
ST. JOHN i. 14.

CHRISTMAS DAY, we are all agreed, is the greatest birthday in the year. It is the birthday of the greatest Man, of the greatest Teacher of men, of the greatest Benefactor of the human race that ever lived. It is this; but it is also much more. For as on this day was born One Who, while He is truly man, is also and immeasurably more than man.

1. He Who was born, as on this day, did not begin to be when He was conceived by his human mother; since He had already existed from before all worlds—from an eternity. His human nature, His human body, and His human soul were not, as is the case with us, the whole outfit of His being; they were in truth the least important part of it. He had already lived for an eternity when He condescended to make a human body and a human soul in an entirely new sense His own by uniting them to His divine and eternal Person; and then He wore them as a garment, and acted through them as through an instrument, during His life on earth, as He does now in the Courts of Heaven. Thus the Apostle says that He "took upon Him the form of a servant,"* and that "He took not on Him the nature of angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham;"† and so the Collect for to-day pleads that He "took our nature

upon Him and was at this time born of a pure Virgin." And it was in this sense that He became or was made flesh: after having existed from eternity, He united to Himself for evermore a perfect and representative sample of the bodily and immaterial nature of man, and thus clothed with It, as on this day, He entered into the world of sense and time. "The Word was made flesh and tabernacled among us."

It is perhaps not surprising that from the early days of Christianity men should have misconceived or misstated what was meant by this central but mysterious truth of the Christian Creed—the Incarnation of the Eternal Son. In truth the misconceptions have been and are many and great.

Sometimes Christians have been supposed to hold that two persons were united in Christ, instead of two natures in His single Person; sometimes that the Infinite Being was confined within the bounds of the finite nature which He assumed; sometimes that God ceased to be really Himself when He thus took on Him man's nature; sometimes that the human nature which He took was absorbed into or annihilated by union with the Divinity. All of these misconceptions of the true sense of the Apostles have been successively considered and rejected by the Christian Church; and "the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God is God and Man. God of the substance of His Father, begotten before all worlds, and Man of the substance of His mother, born in the world, perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His manhood. Who although He be God and man, yet is He not two but one Christ."*

Thus did the God the Son take the simple out of the dust and lift the poor out of the mire, when He raised our poor human nature to the incomparable prerogative of union with Himself. So real was and is this union, that all the acts, words, and sufferings of His Human Body, all the thoughts, reasonings, resolves, emotions of His Human Soul, while being properly human, are yet

* Phil. ii. 7.

† Heb. ii. 16.

* Athanasian Creed.

also the acts, words, sufferings, the thoughts, reasonings, resolves, and emotions of the Eternal Son, Who controls all, and imparts to all the value and elevation which belong to the Infinite and the Supreme. Thus, although Christ suffered in His human Soul in the garden, and in His human Body on the cross, His sufferings acquired an entirely superhuman meaning and value from the Person of the Eternal Word to Whom His Manhood was joined; and St. Paul goes so far as to say that God purchased the Church with His own blood*—meaning that the blood which was shed by the Crucified was that of a Human Body personally united to God the Son.

It was perhaps inevitable that the question should be asked how such a union of two natures which differ as the Creator differs from the creature—as the Infinite differ from the finite—was possible. It might be enough to reply that with God all things are possible—all things at least which do not contradict His moral perfections—that is to say, His essential nature; and most assuredly no such contradiction can be detected in the Divine Incarnation. But in truth it ought not to be difficult for a being possessed of such a composite nature as is man to answer this question; perhaps such a being as man might have been reasonably expected never to have asked it. For what is the Incarnation but the union of two natures, the Divine and the human, in a single Person, Who governs both? And what is man, what are you and I, but samples—at an immeasurably lower level—of a union of two totally different substances—one material, the other immaterial—under the presidency and control of a single human personality? What can be more remote from each other in their properties than are matter and spirit? what would be more incredible, antecedently to experience, than the union of such substances as matter and spirit—of a human body and a human soul—in a single personality? Yet that they are so united is a matter of experience to every one of us; we only do not marvel at it because we are so intimately familiar with it. Day by day, hour by hour, minute by minute, we observe, each within himself, a central authority, directing and controlling on the one hand, the movements and operations of an animal frame, and on the other the faculties and efforts of an intelligent spirit, both of which find in this central authority or person their point of unity. How this can be we know not; we know not how an immaterial essence can dictate its movements to an arm or a leg, but we see that it does this; and we can only escape from the admitted mystery into difficulties far greater than those which we leave behind, by frankly avowing ourselves materialists, and denying that man has anything that can properly be called a soul, or that he is anything more than an oddly agitated mass of bones and

muscles. If we shrink from this we must recognise, in the composite structure of our own mysterious being, the means of answering the question about the possibility of the Incarnation. "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ."* He who could thus bring together matter and spirit, notwithstanding their utter contrariety of nature, and could constitute out of them a single human personality or being, might surely, if it pleased Him, raise both matter and spirit—a human body and a human soul—to union with His Divinity, under the control of His Eternal Person. Those who have taken even superficially the measure of the twofold nature of man, ought not to find it hard to understand that for sufficient reasons God and man might be united in a single person, or, as St. John says, that the Word might be made flesh and might dwell among us.

But what, it may be asked, can be conceived of as moving God thus to unite Himself with a created form? Is not such an innovation on the associations, if not on the conditions, of His eternal being too great to be accounted for by any cause or motive that we can possibly assign for it?

Here we are in a region in which, it need hardly be said, we dare not indulge our own conjectures as to the fitness of things; we do not know enough of the Eternal Mind to presume to account for Its resolves by any suppositions of human origin. If we are to take a single step forward it must be under the guidance of Revelation. But when men speak of the Incarnation as an innovation on the eternal life of God so great as to be beyond accounting for or even conceiving, they forget a still older innovation—if the word may be permitted—about which there is no room whatever for doubt. They forget that, after existing for an eternity, in solitary blessedness, contemplating Himself and rejoicing in the contemplation, God willed to surround himself with creatures, who should derive their life from Him, and be sustained in it by Him, and should subsist within His all-encompassing Presence, while yet utterly distinct from Him. Creation, surely, was an astonishing innovation on the Life of God; and creation, as we know, involved possibilities which led to much else beyond. If God was to be served by moral creatures endowed with reflective reason, and conscience, and free will, that they might offer Him the noblest, because a perfectly voluntary service, this prerogative dignity necessarily carried with it the possibility of failure, and man, in fact, even at the very beginning of his history, did fail. That God should have created at all is, indeed, a mystery; that He should have created a moral world of which He must have foreseen the history, is a still greater mystery; but, having done this, He—the Eternal Justice, He the Eternal Charity—should have left

* Acts xx. 28.

* Athanasian Creed.

His handiwork to itself, would have been—had it been true or possible—a much greater, and I will add a much darker mystery. As God must have created out of love,* so out of love He must bring a remedy to the ruined creature of His Hands;† though the form of the remedy He alone could prescribe. We do not know whether there were other ways of raising a fallen race; probably there were, since God is infinite in His resources as in all else. But we may be sure that the way adopted was the best. Of other remedies nothing has been told us. What we do know is the truth of that saying, “that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners;”‡ what we do confess before God and man is that, “being of one substance with the Father by Whom all things were made, He for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man.”§

II. And now perhaps some one is thinking to himself what is the appropriateness of much that has been said on the afternoon of such a day as Christmas Day. Let us consider.

In the course of his history man has by turns depreciated and exaggerated his true importance among the creatures of God. Sometimes he has made himself the measure of all things, as though his was the sovereign mind, and the Creator a being whose proceedings could be easily understood by him. Sometimes he has appeared to revel in self-depreciation, placing himself side by side with or below the beasts that perish, insisting on his animal kinship with them, and anxiously endeavouring to ignore or deny all that points to a higher element in his being. Sometimes, in a strange spirit of paradox, he has combined theories which ascribe to himself an origin and a nature as degraded as well can be, with passionate assertions of his capacity to judge of all things in earth and heaven. Just now the depreciatory account of man is the popular one; and we hear echoes of the language which was used on this subject by the early assailants of Christianity. Celsus, the eclectic philosopher who compiled his assortment of objections to the Christian Creed about A.D. 170, insisted once and again that man is not really superior to the more intelligent insects, since bees and ants organise themselves into cities and states under recognised rulers; they make war upon and peace with each other, and appear to experience the same vicissitudes of fortune if they do not feel the same jealousies and ambitions as human beings. Christianity, according to Celsus and other writers, has made man think too much of his own importance in nature; and some modern successors of Celsus, repeating his estimate of man's place among creatures, go on to call attention to the insignificance of man's dwelling-place. We are

reminded that it is no longer possible to think of the earth as the centre of the universe, for whose benefit all else exists; a palace, around which a fair demesne is laid out only with a view to its beauty and usefulness; a comfortable home for the most favoured of God's creatures, to lighten which the sun rises every morning and the stars shine brightly every night. Man can no longer look to the heavens above his head as the spangled roof of the tent in which he dwells; nor can he confidently assume that an eclipse or a conjunction of planets has no other object than to assure him of some secret of his petty destiny. We now know that the planet on which we live is only one of the smaller satellites of our sun, while this sun itself is but one of thousands of heavenly bodies moving in an orbit which it takes vast ages to complete round some undiscovered centre. We now know that our eye rests on stars, the distance of which from this our earth cannot be expressed in figures; stars whose light, flashing with the speed of light, takes, at the least, even centuries to reach us. As we gaze into the boundless spaces which astronomy thus opens for us, the insignificance of man's dwelling-place becomes increasingly evident to us; and as we reflect upon it, it seems to involve and make more and more evident the corresponding and utter insignificance of man.

And this impression about the small worth of human life is deepened by what may be observed of the vicissitudes to which men are exposed, not as individuals, but in masses. It is a commonplace that life comes to be held very cheap during the ravages of an epidemic such as was the plague: the imagination finds it hard to think that much real value can attach to existences which, to all appearance, are destroyed so easily and in such numbers. So, again, the survey of the thousands of dead and dying after a great battle, like Solferino, has for the time being filled spectators with an overpowering sense that man is too worthless a being to be cared for, and that his lot is controlled by a pitiless and mechanical fate. Every ocean steamship that sinks beneath the waves of the Atlantic with its great freight of human lives; every coal mine that is the scene of an explosion, whereby scores of families round the pit's mouth are left without their bread-winner; nay every vast collection of men, such as you may see any day in the streets of London, each one of whom is solitary, unknown, unsympathised with in the great crowd around him—all of these scenes help to deepen the sense of man's pettiness, and lead a large number of human beings to think of themselves and of others as leaves blown about by the wind of destiny—whither or why who can say?

Of course, apart from Christian faith, there is another side to the matter which nature suggests to us. When we look steadily at any one man,—the feeblest, the most worthless, as we may think,

* Jer. xxx. 3.

† 1 Tim. i. 15.

‡ St. John iii. 16.

§ Nicene Creed.

we become conscious of his having titles to profound and anxious interest; his reason, his conscience, his character cannot be attentively examined—whatever be his history—without revealing them.

Whatever men may say in their more sombre moods, they do not really believe in all that some philosophers would tell them about the insignificance of man. Consider the diligence with which a trial for murder is followed by thousands of readers of the papers. Here is a man who, before his arrest as a criminal, threaded his way unnoticed through the crowd; one of the leaves, as we are told, which “drifts anywhither before the wind of destiny.” But this man is put on trial for his life, and he immediately becomes an object of profound interest—of whatever character. Why, if he is really only an animal, whose deeds and whose death are alike prescribed by fate; an animal with no immortal part in him, with no endless destiny before him; why, if this is the case, should the question of life and death be debated more anxiously in his case than in that of an ox or a sheep? Why should the court in which his case is heard be crowded with listeners; the cross-examination of witnesses scanned with such jealous severity; the words that fall from the presiding judge scrutinised with such anxious attention; the reply of the counsel for the prisoner, the summing-up, the verdict of the jury, all waited for with such hushed yet irrepressible eagerness; the report of the trial read and read again by thousands outside the court who have no personal knowledge either of the victim or of the accused, no personal stake, however remote, in the trial whatever? Do you say that this is to be explained by a widely diffused appetite for all that touches on the confines of the horrible; that a sensation relieves the monotony of thousands of lives; and that those who do not need this relief are not superior to the instincts of vulgar curiosity? You cannot have attentively considered the seriousness—I had almost said the passion—with which a trial for murder is followed by persons who would not on any account give time and attention to cases of another kind, if you say this. No; men are thus deeply moved because a human life is at stake; because the future of a man’s destiny is being weighed in the balance; because it is instinctively felt that much more is in question than the fatalism or materialism of some of our modern teachers would allow. Ah! at these solemn moments the depreciatory theories of man’s nature and origin are forgotten; they give way to a higher and more adequate sense of his real place in the Universe. Even the poor prisoner in the dock, who may be guilty of the crime laid to his charge, and on whose countenance, it may be, vice has traced the history of its long and degrading ascendancy—even he for the moment represents the ineffaceable, the indestructible greatness of man. He cannot be sentenced to die

without stirring in us all a sense of our true place among the creatures of God as immortal beings—now that he is bidden to put it to the solemn proof by being forced violently across the line that divides the living from those whom we name the dead.

There are, of course, many other ways in which men show that they recognise the true dignity of their nature, amidst all its feebleness and degradation. But it must be owned that man’s judgment about himself, when he is left to himself, rises and sinks with the varying circumstances of his life, with the varying moods of his mind. Left to himself, man has no very solid ground of confidence in any estimate he may form; and he oscillates with timid indecision between grotesque exaggerations and unworthy denials of his real place among the creatures of God. If he was to discover at once the greatness of his needs and the greatness of his capacities, it must be by some standard utterly independent of himself, by some event breaking in upon and elevating his collective life, as did the Divine Incarnation. By uniting man’s nature for ever to That of the Being Who made him, the Incarnation restored to man his self-respect, while it also made him feel his moral poverty without God, and his utter dependence upon God. But that human nature in which the Eternal Word condescended and condescends to dwell can never be treated by a Christian believer as other than capable of the highest destinies.

Let us think for a moment of the life of Our Lord upon earth as seen from this point of view, as putting such high and exceptional honour upon human nature.

The moral beauty of which mankind is capable appeared in the earthly life of Jesus as it never appeared before, as it has never appeared since. Had men invented such a moral portrait, the invention would have been scarcely less a matter for wonder than the reality; but no literary creation could have made so deep and enduring a mark on generations of human beings as has been made by the life of Jesus. Yet we can only surrender ourselves to its power upon one condition; we must frankly admit that it is the life of the Word made flesh no less truly than the life of the Son of Man. A mere man might have been inspired to say: “Blessed are the poor in spirit; blessed are they that mourn; blessed are the meek; blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness; blessed are the merciful; blessed are the pure in heart; blessed are the peacemakers; blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake.”* But no mere man, being humble and veracious, could have said of himself, “I am the Life”—“I am the Light of the world”—“I and the Father are one thing”—“He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father”—“No

* St. Matthew v. 3-10.

man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son." Jesus says too much about Himself if He is to be measured by a standard of merely human excellence; if He is only man, we cannot say that all His language is either modest or truthful. All indeed falls into its place if He is also the eternal Son of God; in embracing this central and vital truth we recognise the supreme significance of His life as that of God manifest in the flesh. Embrace this truth and it is not hard to understand how His death on Calvary might avail even for much more than the world's redemption, and how at His word the weak and poor elements of water and bread and wine might become channels of spiritual blessings, or veils of a Higher Presence—contact with which would mean new life and power for the bodies and souls of men.

Nor does it matter whether such a life as that of Jesus, radiant with the beauty and charged with the force of God, was lived on a large sun or on a small planet. The moral world has no relation to the material; the Perfect Moral Being is not impressed, as some of our physicists would seem to be, by mere material bulk. If it is true of God that "He hath no pleasure in the strength of an horse, neither delighteth He in any man's legs," so it is true that "since the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Him," the vastest stars and suns have no particular claim, on account of their size, in His regard. When He would unite Himself to a Human Form, in and through Which to achieve the elevation and redemption of the human family, He chose the scene whence the Divine work would be best achieved; He chose the little planet on which we live; He chose as His birth-place not Rome, not even Jerusalem, but Bethlehem, though it was "little among the thousands of Judah;" He was laid in a rude manger outside the crowded village: He did not abhor the Virgin's womb.

III. And therefore Christmas Day is the birthday of the best hopes of man; the second birthday of the human family. No other day in the year reminds us more persuasively of the greatness of man, of the greatness, actual or possible, of every human being. Nothing that can be said about man's capacities, or progress, or prerogatives, or rights, approaches even distantly to what is involved in God's having so loved the human world that He gave His only begotten Son to take our nature upon Him. Already, while He was upon earth we see the meaning of His appearance in the irradiated lives of those around Him. Why is it that poor fishermen, like Peter and Andrew, and peasants like Simon and Jude and James, and tax collectors like Matthew, are far more to us than the great soldiers and statesmen who ruled the Roman world; why is the uncultivated penitent of Magdala infinitely more interesting than the stately ladies who moved amid crowds of prostrate slaves through the halls of the Cæsars? It is because the wonder-

working touch of the Word made flesh had already begun to create in these poor country-folk the first samples of a new humanity in which human nature should recover its lost dignity—its lost self-respect: it is because they would say, each of them from His place in Paradise, what one of them has already written down in the pages of the everlasting Gospel: "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."*

Surely, Christmas, as the birthday of human greatness, should kindle in us the sense of our true Christian dignity, and nerve us to claim and to protect it by all that guards and invigorates true Christian life. May "the Father of Glory give us this spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him, that the eyes of our understanding being enlightened, we may know what is the hope of His calling, and what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe."†

And as Christmas Day is the birthday of true human dignity, so it is the birthday of true human brotherhood. Kneeling around the cradle of the Incarnate Word, we may understand that great sentence of His Apostle, that for the new man, renewed after the image of Him that created him, "there is neither Jew nor Greek circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all."‡ At the manger of Bethlehem, we may dare to look forward, in some coming time, to that union of human lives, of human hearts, of which the noblest of our race have dreamt again and again; to a brotherhood which has sometimes been recommended by abstract arguments, sometimes dictated by revolutionary terrorism, but which to be genuine must be the perfectly free movement of hearts drawn towards each other by a supreme attraction. That attraction we find in the Divine Child of Bethlehem, born that he might redeem and regenerate the world; and all the courtesies and kindnesses of this happy season between members of families, and members of households, and members of the same parish; between the rich and the poor, and the old and the young, and the so-called great and the so-called insignificant are rightly done in His honour, Who by coming to reveal to us what we may be in Him and through Him, came also to unite us with each other in Himself. If the ideal is still as heretofore only too far from being realised, if we hear of sombre jealousies between classes, and of rumours of wars between powerful countries, and of much else at home and abroad that is the negation of that which he came to do, let us look to it that our part—however humble its place in the scale of moral and spiritual agents—be, while we linger on this passing scene, that of those who have

* St. John i. 12. † Eph. i. 17-19. ‡ Col. iii. 11.

heard to some purpose the angel song in the meadows of Bethlehem—"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom God is well pleased."

MAN'S RETROSPECT OF GOD'S MERCY.

A SERMON FOR THE LAST DAY OF THE YEAR BY THE REV. JOSEPH MASKELL, MASTER AND CHAPLAIN OF EMANUEL HOSPITAL, AND ASSISTANT CURATE OF ST. JAMES-THE-LESS, WESTMINSTER.

"If Thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? But *there is* forgiveness with Thee, that Thou mayest be feared."—PSALM CXXX. 3, 4.

ARE we not apt to forget, my brethren, that all that we are and all that we have—everything, in fact, which concerns ourselves and our lives, is intimately connected with God? "It is He that hath made us and not we ourselves." "In Him we live and move and have our being." We belong to Him and are bound to serve and please Him; His will is the standard of all duty; His supreme authority the ground of all moral obligation. Our time, our talents, our whole selves belong to Him, and should be employed in His service. He is eminently the "God with whom we have to do," and in all our actions He is intimately concerned. Sin is rebellion against His just government; holiness is but a reflection of His own life and character. The secret of our right-doing, and therefore of our happiness, is to remember that He is ever present, and that "all things are naked and open" to His unerring vision.

God is a *personal Being*. Theologians, out of the poverty of human language exactly to describe His nature, have tried to define Him as "without body, parts, or passions;" but our hearts crave for a God who is capable of sympathy and love, and in whom we can confide in the dark and difficult journey of life. Some of our scientific teachers, to whom we owe so much for the light they have thrown upon the secrets of the natural world, have thought to dethrone Him from the government of the universe, and to exalt, in His stead, that "constant law," which is but the token of His supreme power and unlimited presence, as "the soul of all things." But we need a God whom we can love, fear, trust, and obey. We cannot yearn after and cherish affection for a mere abstraction. The God of the Bible is eminently a Person! In His character as our Creator, Preserver, Father, and Friend, He is deeply interested in all that we are and all that we do. Sin is a personal offence to Him, while repentance and right-doing add delight and pleasure to His infinite mind, perpetually renewing, so to speak, His "fulness of joy." Nor is He a God who is "very far away," but "about our path and about our bed," sharing in all our lives.

These are very solemn considerations which are apt to be disregarded amidst the petty, but pressing cares of life, and in consequence of our own self-will. "God is not in all our thoughts;" we do not entirely forget Him, perhaps; but we give the chief place to our own selfish aims and advantages. Our own indifference to God lulls us into the belief that He is indifferent to us, and that it matters little what we do, all will in the end come right. From our youth upward we have been accustomed, perhaps, to say and do many things in a thoughtless or self-willed spirit of which sooner or later we become ashamed, and it would be very convenient now to forget them. We did not always realise that they were sinful and wrong, or very sinful and wrong, and we thought little about them in connection with God; but He, to whom "all things are naked and open," knew all about them, cannot forget them, nor pass them by. There are times, also, when they come back with terrible persistency to our own recollection. We can never quite forget them; their dark shadows still haunt our consciences, and their baneful consequences are in a mysterious manner stamped upon our lives. Our present physical health, as well as our present moral character—what are they but the sum total and general result of all our past deeds, evil or good? Each man's life is, as it were, a book in which all his past is written down in letters as legible as if with ink and pen. We carry to our graves the scars of old wounds, healed only to the outward eye, and every uncorrected error of diet, perversion of function, and misuse of faculty, has helped to enfeeble our present condition. It is not only in God's "book of remembrance" that our actions are written; we write them in our own being; stamp them into our lives and characters; they enter into the very texture of our frames, and are built into our memories. Is there one of us, looking back upon life, that can escape the recollection of follies and sins in the past, and of actions that conscience cannot dwell upon with complacency? If we could live our lives over again, should we wish to alter nothing? We must all look back upon deeds that were thoughtlessly done, actions that brought no true blessing either upon ourselves or upon others, and over which we would fain draw the veil of oblivion; secret sins, perhaps, which none but God's eye could see, and of which we are now ashamed! It is well that we should cherish the recollection of these things; good for us that conscience should be awakened from slumber and the soul rendered sensitive to its own heritage of evil. To know ourselves, and how by past experiences to correct the evil tendencies of our nature, is the secret of a better life. To "press onward" is perhaps nobler than to "look back." But we shall press onward with the greater caution and success if we sometimes wisely look back. Such a time of retrospection

and thoughtful reflection is this, the last night of the dying year. We are now forcibly reminded of the past, of wasted opportunities, of misspent moments, never to return. Memory recalls much that seemed to have faded out of our life's history; the pale ghosts of the past flit before us, awakening reflections into which regretful sentiments largely enter. All of us, indeed, can look back upon years of blessing; "goodness and mercy have followed us all the days of our life." Well, the deeper our gratitude to God, the deeper will be our sense of past unprofitableness and imperfection. To those, indeed, who have laid down their burdens of sin at the foot of the Cross of Christ, in sincere repentance for the past and in steadfast resolutions of amendment for the future, the retrospect may be sorrowful and humiliating, but will be entirely free from hopeless despair.

The true penitent, to whom the gracious promises of the Gospel are so freely addressed, would dishonour God if he suffered despairing thoughts to take possession of his soul. But the impenitent, if there be any such here, the reckless and profane, those whose lives are spent in selfish indifference to God, will do well to remember this day; that "God requireth that which is past;" that He is of "purer eyes than to look upon sin" without infinite aversion; and that "it is appointed unto all men once to die, and after death the judgment;" for "we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, to answer for the things done in the body according to that we have done, whether it be good or evil."

The thought is indeed a solemn one if we estimate its importance aright. In morals, as in nature, nothing is really lost. The drop of water that is spilt on the ground, the dead leaves that rot in the soil, the curling smoke that seeks the atmosphere, and seems to fade away into nothingness, only chemically combine with other substances to exist in other forms. In a deep and true sense matter is indestructible. And, no doubt, the impression of all that we say or do still exists, although much of it has passed from our own remembrance, and was beyond the reach of others' ken. Deeds and words long since forgotten, impure thoughts, wasted time, duties neglected, warnings despised, conscience slighted, divine ordinances and God-given remedies for sin treated with contempt, secret vices, stolen and unlawful pleasures, none of these things are dead; they are all known to God, registered in His book of remembrance, and the day will come when this book shall be opened, and "the Lord will come who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." Thus, "the deeds we do, the words we say,

"Into still air they seem to fleet,
We count them past fore'er away,
But they shall last, till that great day
That calls us to the judgment seat."

It will little serve us, however, to think of the day that is to decide our destiny as merely future. Death dogs our steps at every moment of life and at any moment we may be called away to our long home and to our great account. In truth, God is passing judgment upon us already. Our sentence of condemnation or acquittal is already registered in God's mind. If we are living without God in the world, alienated from Him by wicked works, and cherishing wilful sin, we are "condemned already," and have forfeited the heavenly inheritance.

But, blessed be God, while there is life there is hope. The sentence pronounced against us is suspended, so long as the long-suffering of God spares the sinner and the way lies open that leads to repentance. This was the conviction of the Psalmist, awakened to an acute sense of the misery and shame of sin. Out of the depths of his guilty disgrace and fearful contrition he cried, "If Thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who can stand," or, as it is beautifully rendered in our Prayer Book version, "If Thou, Lord, wilt be extreme to mark what is done amiss: O Lord, who may abide it?" That God *does* mark iniquity we know. Nothing can escape his omniscient mind. "Thou hast set our misdeeds before Thee, our secret sins in the light of Thy countenance." "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good." "The ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and He pondereth all his goings." And sin is "the abominable thing that He hates." And, yet, He delighteth in mercy. "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed." He is "not extreme to mark what is done amiss." "There is forgiveness with Thee," is the hope of the Psalmist under the deepest conviction of sin and the charter of his deliverance. God deals with us as a kind and compassionate Father. He cannot shut His eyes to our sin, nor make us happy while we remain in sin; but "His mercy is over all His works." None need despair, however far they have wandered, like the prodigal, from their Father's house, or however long they have delayed to return. God's mercy is like the sunlight which shines impartially upon the ice-fields of the north as upon the smiling plains of a more genial clime. It cannot bless all soils alike, but its light is diffused throughout space, endowing the wide world of nature with fruitfulness and beauty. God's mercy is like the air we breathe, free and yet priceless in value. No sin of ours can quench His love; He waits to be gracious to all, and "willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live." He has impressed indeed a law upon our nature which shuts the gate of happiness upon all who continue in sin; but He is pitiful and compassionate to us sinners. There must be some point where the hand of His justice is stayed and prevented by

His omnipotent mercy, and where "mercy rejoiceth against judgment." "He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are but dust." When He gave us His perfect law and required our complete obedience to it, He knew perfectly well that there would be great imperfections and shortcomings in our fulfilment of it. But, in the meantime, if we break we must pay; the work of His justice must be done; if we sin we must suffer. We cannot escape the penalty of wrong-doing; but, even here, His mercy is displayed. It is through the discipline of failure, transgression and consequent suffering, that He would lead us to Himself and fit us for a better life. The Psalmist, then, was right in expressing, even under the deepest sense of sin, his trust in God's mercy. "There is forgiveness with Thee, that Thou may'st be feared." We are so helpless and undone, in consequence of sin, that we can only plead for mercy. And we do not plead in vain. There is forgiveness for all who need it, grace and strength in exact proportion to our necessity and infirmity.

Now, if this mercy and forgiveness of God was so fully accepted by the Psalmist and others of God's people under the Old Testament dispensation, how much more ought we to trust and rejoice in it to whom God has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ? The life and death of our Master and only Saviour is, from first to last, a clear revelation of divine, inexhaustible mercy. In His miracles of healing, in His pity and compassion for the sins and sorrows of men, in His persevering benevolence in the face of the fiercest opposition, insult, and cruelty; and, above all, in the patient, willing sacrifice of Himself on the Cross, we have a revelation of God's goodness and mercy, which ought to melt all hearts into wondering gratitude, affectionate trust, and cheerful service. In Jesus we have not only the pledge that God is merciful, but the assurance that there is no sin between us and God of which He has not borne the penalty and taken away the guilt. In His name and for His sake we may go to God as children to an offended, but kindly and gracious Father, whose arms are wide open to receive us as soon as we are willing to return.

Let us dwell a little upon that expression—*willing to return!* God's mercy, to be of any real service to us, must meet with a corresponding sentiment in our own minds. There must be the penitential sense of sinful unworthiness, a genuine sorrow for sin, free confession of all that we have done amiss, and a sincere desire truly and earnestly to forsake sin. Proud indifference, selfish impenitence, and cowardly distrust stand outside the gate of mercy. All this must be renounced before an entrance can be found. God's mercy and forgiveness is not a gift which we can afford to despise and reject; judgment must do its bitter work with us if we continue to treat mercy with neglect. The Bible speaks of a day of grace,

during which the sceptre of God's royal pardon is held out, and the sinner may return. Mercy rejected, other bitter measures must follow; justice must work where mercy has failed. It is written in history that Alexander the Great, when he besieged a city, set down a lighted lamp before its walls, offering mercy to all who submitted to his authority while the light of the lamp lasted. When the last drop of oil was spent it was too late; the deadly siege began. Thus God, in sparing our lives, forfeited by sin, sets, as it were, a lighted lamp before us, giving us time and opportunity to repent. May the conviction of His long-suffering goodness lead us all to repentance; begetting in us that godly sorrow not to be repented of, which issues in amendment of life. "There is forgiveness with Thee," says the Psalmist, "that Thou mayest be feared." The true fear of God is that reverential awe of His authority, and anxiety to fulfil His will which grows out of a sense of God's forgiveness, and is the fruit of love. It is not the fear which springs from despairing conviction of sin; but the reverence which accompanies gratitude. Despair only hardens the heart, love melts it into thankful regard, and then awakens the spirit of obedient service. It begets fear; but it is only the fear of not loving Him enough, of coming short of His glory, and failing to please Him; a fear which has respect unto all His commandments, and shrinks only from the thought of disobeying His will.

Are not those considerations most appropriate to the occasion which has brought us together this day? Solemn is the voice of the departing year. It tells us of past ingratitude to God, of neglected opportunities and profitless service; but above this voice may be heard the clearer and more tuneful notes of the New Song, sung by those who know by experience that God is a God of mercy.

Are there to be found, my brethren, in your lives, and written in your memories, as there are most certainly recorded in God's memory against you, accusations of conscience, the remembrance of a past which has been, for the most part, unprofitable, unworthy and evil. Cherish the shame and the sorrow which the retrospection inspires; but carry it confidently to the footstool of the mercy-seat of your Heavenly Father. Regrets for the past are useless unless they are accompanied by contrition, confession, and a sincere resolution to live better in the future than in the past. Let, then, the time past of our lives suffice us to have lived in sinful self-will; let it all be buried in the grave of the dying year: and may the voices of the New Year invite us to a renewed trust in God's mercy, to a more circumspect and purer life; to a more decided separation from sin, and a better conformity to God's will. May the New Year be to all of us a happy and prosperous

year ! But we cannot be truly happy unless we "walk in the light" of God's lovingkindness, and, entering into a holy fellowship with Him, learn day by day to love and fear Him more and more, till we come to the full inheritance of His everlasting kingdom.



THE Seatonian prize at Cambridge for an English poem on a sacred subject, by a Master of Arts, has been awarded to the Rev. E. W. Bowling, M.A., formerly Fellow of St. John's. The subject was "On Earth Peace."

THE diocese of St. Asaph is losing one of its ablest clergymen by the Lord Chancellor's presentation of the vicar of Oswestry to the vicarage of Potton, Ely. During a sixteen years' incumbency, Canon Howell Evans has made Oswestry a centre of Church life. The Association of Church Workers in the parish is numbered by hundreds. The restoration of the parish church, at the cost of £12,000, one of the first acts of his incumbency, has been followed by many other good works, to all of which the vicar has given liberally, both his time and his money. Canon Evans represents the Chapter of St. Asaph in Convocation. He will be missed both in the parish and the diocese.

ON Friday, the 30th ult., a meeting was held in the vestry-room of St. Bride's, Fleet Street, to consider a letter which the Charity Commissioners had addressed to the clerk on the question of Ulsthorpe's Charity. This charity consists of the rent (about £500) of a house and shop in Fleet Street, the object of the donor being "the restoration of the parish church fabric and the maintenance of its ornaments in good repair." The chief paragraph in the letter from the Commissioners ran thus: "As to Ulsthorpe's Charity, the accounts furnished to the Commissioners show that of the items of expenditure to which the income is now applied some are certainly not within the terms of the trust, and as to others it is doubtful whether they can be so considered. If, therefore, the Commissioners proceed to frame a scheme, on the lines suggested by the resolution of the vestry of October 6th, it will be hereafter impossible to make such payments, and the expenditure in question must be provided from other sources." The chairman (the Rev. E. C. Hawkins, vicar), after some discussion, pointed out the important interests involved. Mr. J. Lewes suggested that there should be a committee appointed, consisting of nine gentlemen, who should draw up a scheme on behalf of the parishioners. This suggestion was adopted, and the committeemen were the vicar, churchwardens, Fortescue and Walters, junior, Messrs. Deputy Walter, John Lobb, Hancock, Paterson, Lewes, and Iser, who will submit their scheme to a public vestry in about a fortnight. Mr. Lewis further suggested that the chapel-of-ease (Holy Trinity) and St. Bride's should be united, inasmuch as the latter was capable of holding all the church-going parishioners. This would greatly strengthen their position in dealing with the parochial charities and prove beneficial in every way.

THE Queen's Letters Patent conferring the deanery of Rochester upon Canon Hole were issued by the Lord Chancellor at the close of the past year, and bear date the 31st of December, 1887. The institution by the Bishop and installation in the cathedral are expected immediately.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.

Testimonial
 From Mr. CHARLES WHEELER, Barford, Warwick.
 "I have felt so greatly benefited by wearing your
ELECTROPATHIC BELT, that it affords me
 pleasure to be able to testify to its curative power.
 The swelling and pain in my legs have quite left me, and
 I experience a comfortable and warming sensation
 throughout my body."

GOUT & SCIATICA CURED

Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of
 the Nerves, stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,
 should at once stop physicing, and remit 21s. for
 HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain
 immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials
 POST FREE. MEDICAL BATTERY CO. LTD.
 52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1888.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

WE have shown in previous articles that the education of women, however deep and thorough, is never likely to obliterate the mental differences of men and women. Another argument, which, if it could be substantiated, would have great weight with us, has been advanced by a few members of the medical profession against the higher education of ladies. This argument is that the nervous system and general *physique* of young women is not sufficiently robust for hard study, and that therefore many are likely to impair their health by the efforts and excitement incidental to our system of school and University examinations. This view was strongly advocated by Dr. Withers Moore in his Presidential Address to the British Medical Association at Brighton in 1886. In two articles under the dates of August 21st and 28th of that year, we endeavoured to expose the fallacies and unsatisfactory character of the Doctor's reasoning. We have not since had any reason to doubt the accuracy and validity of the views we then expressed, and would now refer our readers to those two numbers of the PULPIT for answers to the *à priori* physiological arguments adduced by Dr. Moore. The question is essentially one of fact, and must be answered by the results of the large and numerous experiments now in progress. Physiology demonstrates that in the human, as in most other animals, the female is inferior and subordinate to the male in blood, muscles, bone, and brain; but it does not follow that her nervous energy is less, and that, for fear of exhausting it so that it will never be replaced, she should be shut out from the exercise of the faculties of her mind

and body, which exercise is the only known means and agent for strengthening and improving her brain as well as her blood and muscles. Surely it would be highly impolitic for the community to debar woman, whether by sentimental, social, or political disabilities, from the beneficent and strength-engendering exercise of all her faculties. We hold that the unit of humanity is man and woman, and not, as is generally supposed, man or woman in their separate and individual capacity; and if woman is to be a real helpmeet for the man, she ought to be encouraged, for her own not less than for his welfare, to enter into, if not share, all his manual, moral, and intellectual pursuits. It is a purely imaginary and baseless hypothesis to suppose that our race will degenerate and ultimately die out if women enter into the manual and intellectual occupations of men. We believe that the higher education of women, if pursued with reasonable precautions against over-pressure, and with due provision for bodily exercise, will *ipso facto* falsify these anticipations and prove them to be the baseless and sentimental dreams of a few medical pessimists.

In the year 1885 we made inquiries of the medical men, and of lady superintendents in Cambridge, as to the effects of college life and University studies on the physical health of the women students. The general opinion of these expert and competent witnesses was that, as a rule, the regular exercise of body and mind, and the prescribed discipline at Girton and Newnham Colleges greatly improved the health and physical stamina of the women. One or two cases were mentioned of girls who, owing to feeble or diseased inherited constitutions, had broken down, and were unable to bear the studies of the place. These were quite exceptional cases, and it would be untrue to quote them as victims of over-pressure. In truth and reality they were the victims, not of God-appointed work, but of sin-entailed hereditary disease, which so terribly lowers the vitality of our Christian population.

Inasmuch as a girl is more emotional and more self-sacrificing than a boy, her studies will require, especially at first, to be more carefully regulated and adjusted to her physical strength. If reasonable care and supervision be exercised that health be not impaired by excess in study, which is just as deleterious as excess in any other matter, we see no reason why women should not admit of culture as broad and deep as our schools and Universities are able to supply. By encouraging women in every possible way to obtain for themselves the intrinsic advantages of learning, we shall confer an inestimable boon on posterity, and, as we have shown, we shall not obliterate the mental differences between men and women. These differences are as immutable as the laws of nature, and are all complementary to one another, fitly and beautifully joined together in the human

organism of man and woman. There need be no fear that this higher education will convert the woman into an unnatural copy of the man. The result will be that one-half of the human race will be greatly advanced in intelligence and usefulness. This, if we are not mistaken, will lead to a state which is so philosophically as well as so poetically described by the Laureate:—

The woman's cause is man's : they rise or sink
Together, dwarf'd or god-like, bond or free.
Then let her make herself her own.

To give or keep, to live and learn to be
All that not harms distinctive womanhood.
For woman is not undevelop't man,
But diverse : could we make her as the man,
Sweet Love were slain : his dearest bond is this,
Not like to like, but like in difference.

Yet in the long years liker must they grow ;
The man be more of woman, she of man ;
He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world ;
She mental breadth, nor fail in childward care,
Nor lose the child-like in the larger mind ;
Till at the last she set herself to man,
Like perfect music into noble words.

Then comes the statelier Eden back to men :
Then reign the world's great bridals, chaste and calm
Then springs the crowning voice of human kind.
May these things be !

CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.*

PARTIES IN THE REVISION SYNOD.

SIR,—In yesterday's PULPIT there is a letter from "Even-Handed Justice," saying that he (E.-H. J.), did not say that there was a friendly alliance between the Broad and Low parties in the Irish Synod for the banishment of the Athanasian Creed and the expurgation of the Baptismal Services. I do not find that Mr. Murphy, in his letter in PULPIT of 24th December, spoke of a "friendly alliance," or that he has mistaken "Even-Handed Justice." Mr. Murphy speaks of "an alliance"; which is the term used in "Even-Handed Justice's" letter in the PULPIT of 12th November. The latter, in his postscript in letter in yesterday's PULPIT, speaks of "the contracting parties."

I was a member of the Synod while the alterations in our Prayer Book were being made. I endorse Mr. Murphy's statement, that is, I never heard of such an alliance as "Even-Handed Justice" speaks of, in either public debate or private conversation. I go further, and I take it on myself to say, that there was no such alliance, outside of the imagination of "Even-Handed Justice." He says that he has division-lists. Division-lists of House of Commons' votes may prove alliances between parties; in the case of the Irish Synod, where members voted according to their consciences, and not according to corrupt

bargains, they prove nothing. "Even-Handed Justice" says in his letter in the PULPIT of 12th November, that he states "facts which must be known to all members of the then Synod." These "facts" are not known to me, and they are not known to Mr. Murphy. I beg to suggest that "Even-Handed Justice" shall produce, say, one member of the then Synod who will endorse his statement, and give some evidence of the correctness of the statement.

If "Even-Handed Justice" cannot do this—cannot produce a witness who will give real evidence of an "alliance," of the existence of "contracting parties"—evidence which is tangible, and not a mere reference to the votes of individuals who must be presumed, till the contrary is shown, to have voted conscientiously—I beg to suggest to you, sir, that you shall exclude his letters from your pages. Accusations of the nature that your correspondent "Even-Handed Justice" makes against the Irish Church, and its principal and most valued laymen and priests and bishops, should not be brought lightly. If they are based on any facts, the facts certainly should be published; but if they are not based on facts, while they are at the moment offensive, in the end they will prove despicable, and will publish nothing but the malevolence of the person who advances them.

B.

Dublin, 1st January, 1888.

SIR,—“Even-Handed Justice,” in the PULPIT of yesterday, writes:—“I did not say that there was a friendly alliance between the Broad and Low Parties [in the Church of Ireland] for the banishment of the Athanasian Creed and the expurgation of the Baptismal Services.” But as he speaks afterwards of “the contracting parties,” his disavowal does not amount to much.

I should not write again, were it not that I cannot let the implication pass uncontradicted, that such Broad Churchmen as Bishop Reichel and myself—if the name is rightly applied to us—deny or doubt the Incarnation. The Bishop’s sermons are well known to the readers of the PULPIT, and for my own views on the subject I refer to my book, “The Scientific Bases of Faith,” Macmillan, 1872.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, January 1st, 1888.

MEANING OF WORDS OF ADMINISTRATION.

SIR,—Allow me to send you what I forgot to affix as a P.S. to my letter on this subject in your last number.

It is worthy of remark that the old forms of Sarum, etc., want the words, “which was given for thee.” These were added, no doubt, to raise the thoughts from what is given by the priest to the source of grace above, as a *sursum corda*. In many of them the benefit to the soul alone is spoken of as if our body could not be affected by the mere appearances of bread, which alone were supposed to remain. These conclusions may be fanciful, but they are certainly founded on fact.

C. C., V.-G.

THE BURNING BUSH—A TYPE OF WHAT?

SIR,—To this query I would reply, it is type of our Lord’s Divinity, resident in His humanity. That the fire did not commit its burning powers to the bush may typify that our Lord’s humanity does not partake of the omnipresence of the Deity.

2. Some think that the burning bush typifies our Lord’s presence, or the presence of His spirit and grace in the Holy Eucharist. This is not unlikely. The bush in which God appeared was not worshipped. So neither was the bread, which grace descends upon, worshipped by the Primitive Church. Before they ate, they did worship, but it was God, and not the bread. Moses was not forbidden to worship the bush. He did not do so, nor, we may be sure, think of doing so. God also appeared on Mount Sinai, and the ground around was pronounced holy. But the Mount was no more worshipped than the bush. The brazen serpent which was worshipped was broken up. Aaron’s rod was not adored. Neither was the tabernacle, upon which the Divine presence rested. It would be vain to argue that as Moses was not forbidden, he allowably adored the bush. Silence might thus be construed into allowance of all not expressly forbidden. One might go on to worship all employed by God, as the trumpets at Jericho, and the River Jordan. But this would be childish.

3. It cannot be too often remarked that what our Lord said was not “this is Myself”—as Rome would have it, “soul and divinity”—but “this is my Body,” broken, given, and dead—my *Cadaver*—not now existing. There is no body now, but His glorified natural Body, bound to one place, like any other natural body; but capable, by grace, of supplying every possible want of our souls and bodies. Who can place limits to this power, and say that all is insufficient, without actual contact with His humanity?

4. There is no force in the neuter gender of “this,” as if it cannot mean bread, else it would be masculine. Let it be this thing, if people will have it so. Do the words make the change, if so, they are not true. If they are true, they do not make the change, but only declare it as FACT. But the gender has nothing to do with the question.

5. St. Paul’s words are most important. “The bread which we break,” he calls it bread after consecration. “Is it not the communication, or dividing among ourselves of the Body of Christ?” So the bread conveys to us that grace from Christ in Heaven, which he calls His Body—Rome thus explains it, “Is not Christ’s Body the means of joining us to His Body?” This makes two bodies, so that the body which we have eaten joins us to a body not eaten.

6. As our Lord says, “the flesh profiteth nothing,” it cannot be true that it is by His natural flesh being joined to our flesh, by actual contact, that the immortality of our bodies is secured. If so, the flesh would profit much indeed.

C. C., V.-G.

AT Selwyn College, Cambridge, there will be an examination on March 20 for three or four Scholarships, confined to members of the Church of England. The subjects of the examination will be mathematics and classics. A subject for an English essay will be set for all candidates.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY: A POPULAR COMMENTARY, WITH FORTY SERMONETTES."
By A. Rowland, LL.B., B.A. London: Nisbet & Co.

MR. ROWLAND'S commentary is only meant as "a popular exposition of a singularly interesting Epistle." But we think he would have done better to have omitted the commentary part, and have given us in exchange, if necessary, a few more sermonettes. For the commentary is really too popular; we do not, that is, see what help it can be to anybody. A person of ordinary intelligence can understand without help as much as Mr. Rowland tells him, and any difficulties he may feel Mr. Rowland will not help. Take, for instance, the notes on verses 15 and 16 of chapter iii:—

"The House of God.—The Church is so designated because God owns it, dwells in it, and will complete it. The Church of the living God suggests a contrast with the splendid Temple of Diana in Ephesus, which enshrined a dead image. It is much disputed whether the pillar and ground of the truth refers to the Church, as the Revised Version implies, or to the religious truth, described in the next verse, on which the Church rests."

"Verse 16.—The six clauses of this verse appear in the original in a form so metrical and euphonious that they formed not improbably a hymn or a form of creed. The word 'God' appearing in the Authorised Version is properly omitted in the Revised Version as resting on 'no sufficient ancient evidence.' He who was manifested in the flesh (1 John i. 2), justified in the spirit. Compare Luke vii. 35. The meaning is that the Lord Jesus was justified in His claims; was proved to be what He was by the Spirit, who dwelt in Him (John iii. 34), and raised Him from the dead (Rom. i. 4). Seen of angels, who ministered to Him throughout His earthly life (Matt. iv. 11; Luke xxii. 43).

"Preached among the nations.—Observe the contrast between the holy angels and the sinful nations—the two extremes meeting in Christ. Believed on in the world.—The result of the preaching (2 Thess. i. 10). Received up in glory—at His ascension (Luke xxi. 51; Acts i. 9-11)."

All this is no doubt quite true (though for ourselves we think Timothy himself is referred to as the pillar, seeing *στυλος* elsewhere refers to persons), but surely it explains only as much as hardly needed explanation.

Of the sermonettes we can say that they are good, but not more than that. In our opinion they contain rather too many quotations. Not the words, but the thoughts of his predecessors, a preacher should reproduce, otherwise the new and old seldom agree. Quotations in a sermon should only sparkle, like stars; they should never break it into fragments. If Mr. Rowland is going to write on the Second Epistle to Timothy, we would strongly advise—sermonettes only.

THE *Tablet* says that among other persons received into the Roman Catholic Church a fortnight ago by Father Vaughan, of Manchester, were the Rev. R. F. R. Conder and his wife. According to Crockford, the Rev. René Francis Reignier Conder is a B.A. of Oxford, and was ordained by the Bishop of Rochester

in 1882. He has been curate of St. Paul's, Wimbledon Park; of St. Mark's, Surbiton, and of St. John the Divine, Kennington.

THE Rev. F. Goldsmith, vicar of Halling, Kent, has been appointed to the deanery of Perth, West Australia, in succession to the Very Rev. Joseph Gegg, who has held the post since 1875, and has returned to England. Mr. Goldsmith will probably not go out till March or April.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barrett, Rev. D. W., M.A., Vicar of Nassington, Northamptonshire; Rector of Chipping Barnet, Herts.
Blundell, Rev. Canon, M.A., Vicar of Halsall; Rural Dean of Ormskirk.
Bond, Rev. C. W., M.A., Vicar of All Souls', Brighton; Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Brighton.
Davies, Rev. Charles Harrison, B.A., late Curate of Whittington; Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of St. David's.
Edgell, Rev. John, Rector of Compton Beauchamp, Berks.
Gathercole, Rev. Michael Augustus, M.A., Rector of Santon and Vicar of Santon Downham, Norfolk.
Goldsmith, Rev. F., Vicar of Halling, Kent; Dean of Perth, West Australia.
Grier, Rev. Prebendary, Vicar of Rugeley and Rural Dean; Vicar of Hednesford, Staffordshire.
Hannah, Rev. Prebendary, M.A., Vicar of St. Nicholas's; Vicar of Brighton and Rector of West Blatchington.
Henstock, Rev. Francis William, M.A., Rector of Dry Drayton, Cambridge.
Marshall, Rev. Francis Cotton, M.A., Rector of Little Wilbraham, Cambridge.
Millington, Rev. W., Vicar of St. Paul's, Southport; Rural Dean of North Meols.
Ogden, Rev. Frederick Esse, Vicar of Long Crendon, Bucks.
Seely, Rev. William, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Sprigg, Rev. H. Guildford, late Vicar of Christ Church, Battersea; Diocesan Missioner in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Stephenson, Rev. Jacob, M.A., Senior Curate of Alverstoke; Vicar of St. John's, Forton, Hants.
Wamby, Rev. Cornelius Copner, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Westcott, Rev. George Herbert, B.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Birch, Rev. Charles Edward, during fifty-five years Rector of Wiston, second son and last of the family of the late Very Rev. and Ven. Thomas Birch, D.D., Dean of Battle and Archdeacon of Lewes, Sussex, at Wiston Rectory, on the 27th ult., aged 81.
Brierly, Rev. James, M.A., Cantab., and J.P. for the County of Chester, at Mossley Hall, Congleton, on the 29th ult., aged 74.
Bunbury, Rev. Thomas Henry, for thirty-three years Vicar of Great Warley, at Christ Church Vicarage, Great Warley, Essex, on the 2nd inst., aged 82.
Denton, Rev. William, M.A., for thirty-eight years Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Moor Lane, Cripplegate, at 22, Westbourne Square, on the 2nd inst., aged 72.
Earle, Rev. Lenord Harcourt, M.A., Rector of Conisholme, on the 26th ult., aged 52.
Ensor, Rev. F., at Lustleigh Rectory, on the 25th ult.
Gretton, Rev. William Henry, at Coney Green, Up. Hatherley, Cheltenham, on the 20th ult., aged 60.
Harrison, Rev. James Knowles, at Bridgerule Vicarage, Holsworthy, N. Devon, on the 28th ult., aged 68.
Smith, Rev. W. H., M.A., twenty-five years Vicar of Dronfield, at the Vicarage, Dronfield, on the 31st ult., aged 76.



The Church of England Pulpit.

PATIENCE IN WORK.

BY PROFESSOR T. G. BONNEY, D.Sc., LL.D.,
F.R.S., HON. CANON OF MANCHESTER, AND
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP.

A SERMON PREACHED AT THE ORDINATION IN
MANCHESTER CATHEDRAL ON THE FOURTH
SUNDAY IN ADVENT, 1887.

"Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain."—ST. JAMES v. 7.

THE key-note sounded in these words is one which should be dominant in every great undertaking, most of all in that to which you dedicate yourselves to-day. It would be easy to find one which, like the sound of a trumpet, seemed at first sight better fitted to stir the heart and awaken enthusiasm, but none which in my opinion is so much needed, especially at the present time.

The Apostle bids his hearers to be content to sow, and to wait till the appointed season before they expect to reap the fruits. The husbandman in Palestine sows the seed in the late autumn; then come the November rains, when he must perforce let it lie in the ground. Again, at the end of the winter, there is another rainy period, preventing field work; then, in the month of May, some half-a-year after the sowing, he puts the sickle into the corn. During this period he has had to work, to wait, and even to watch, knowing always that he could not accelerate the ripening by a single day. Laws were in operation over which he had no control. The most that he could do was to give them free play by removing impediments and by counteracting obstacles.

The Apostle refers us to a law of nature, that is, to a law of God. As was the wont of his Master, he grounds his teaching upon the order of nature. To this we are constantly referred for lessons in the earlier days of Christianity; for the divorce of what God hath joined together is the outcome of a later age, and a less healthy faith. The more carefully we consider it, the more shall we see that nature has analogies with grace, and that diverse as they may seem in their modes of manifestation, there is an underlying unity in the spiritual as in the material forces.

What laws, then, do we see working in nature? Two especially—the law of continuity and the law

of development. The law of continuity: that is to say, that every event at any time is the outcome of a long series of antecedent causes; the law of development: that from the germ comes the seedling, from the mature plant the flower, and from the flower at last the fruit.

Students of science for years past have been engaged in deciphering the picture-writing of the book of Nature. The result of their labours has been to carry us back into a far distant past. We are enabled to behold the surface of this globe as it solidifies in cooling, to watch the gathering of seas in its depressions, until after many years it becomes habitable by living creatures. These at first are simple in organisation, less specialised in function than those of succeeding ages. As time proceeds we note the appearance of new types of plants and animals, higher in the scale of being—"the old order changing, yielding place to new," until at last man enters upon the scene, the first of beings of whom it could be said that he was made in the image of God. In the uniformity of this order there are indeed minor catastrophic changes; birth and death also are discontinuities in the individual life, but with these exceptions continuity and development are the laws which we formulate by induction from the order of nature.

The testimony of history leads to the same conclusion, when its facts receive inductive treatment, and this, as the only scientific method, is alone likely to produce any really useful results. Those unnumbered centuries which fade away into the distant past, the fragmental records of which are being slowly recovered and pieced together by students, those centuries exhibit one long preparation for the coming of Christ, and the establishment of a spiritual kingdom. In these distant ages we can now see men, as it were, feeling in the darkness after God, gradually laying aside the imperfect conceptions and puerile superstitions of the childhood of a race. We can watch the growth of a deeper sense of human unworthiness, of a clearer apprehension of the Divine perfection, of a purer morality, of a more assured faith, and of an eternal hope. So that in the Gospel all that is best and noblest in the teaching of sage and prophet alike is embodied, and we recognise thankfully and hopefully the work of the preparation of man in the long period of the dawn which heralded the rising of the Son of Righteousness.

But even then the process of development was not ended. In the order of nature the actual rising of the sun is an epoch of rapid passage from shadow into light; yet as the hours advance towards noon, that light increases in brilliancy and intensity. So has it been in the centuries which have elapsed since the first great Advent. True that after the analogy of the natural day there have been clouds which have obscured the light; true that the darkest and most misleading in their effects, like the fogs of a great city, have been

mainly of man's own raising; true, that the tendency to deterioration or to hurtful exaggeration, bringing as its penalty the "Nemesis of disproportion," has produced so much sorrow, suffering, and superstition, that we are sometimes tempted to think that no sacrifice would be too great could we recover the clear light and the fresh coolness of those early hours. Yet, although these evil tendencies have done their worst, although too often the spiritual guides of our race have led their flocks back into air infected by pagan idolatries, instead of upwards on the slopes of the Mount of God; yet, notwithstanding, that race as a whole has attained a higher standard of moral consciousness, and to us a better, because a less imperfect, knowledge of God is possible than it was to the Christian of the first century.

We often hear the lament that this is a sceptical age. We are told that men no longer listen to the voice of the Church. Certainly when her representatives talk nonsense, men tell them so in very plain terms. If that were all, I for one should make no complaint. The only difference I can recognise between ordinary nonsense and religious nonsense is that the latter is more mischievous than the former, and so should have the prompter treatment from the besom of destruction. But undoubtedly, apart from this prevalence to outspoken criticism, in itself a healthy feature, and salutary, if unpleasant, to those exposed to it—the present is an anxious time. He would be a bold man who would venture to predict what will be the state of England in the beginning of the coming century. A cloud has been rising and gathering for some years, and now darkens the sky; a cloud, where the destructive electricity of rapine and murder and the vilest tyranny is concealed in the vapours of high-sounding phrases of universal benevolence and virtue. But if this cloud, as has happened before, and I pray may happen again, be dissipated by the untiring light of Christ's Gospel, then I will predict there will be for the coming age a stronger faith: for it will be founded on a clearer knowledge, it will be the faith of the man as compared with the faith of the youth.

Into the arena of contest, at this important crisis of our national history, you are this day about to descend. Let me, then, for a few moments, call attention to a very great danger and a very great temptation to which you will all be exposed. The danger and the temptation are the outcome of an infection in the spirit of the age, and it is one suggested by the text which I have chosen, and the remarks which I have been making.

In one word, a fault, perhaps the fault, of the age is impatience. Whatever is done in the present day, we must have "results" as we call them. Well, I am as opposed as any man can be to a waste either of time or money, but I consider worthless results, bad results, as in some ways worse than no results at all. A house built in a hurry is

pretty sure to double its cost in endless repairs before many years are over, and is very apt to tumble down on the heads of its occupants. So is it with all the work inspired by an impatient spirit. God has set in the world His laws of continuity and development. We, in our conceit, imagine that we can overrule those laws. You may as reasonably flatter yourselves that you can gather summer fruits in this country for Christmas-day, or alter the position of the earth's axis of rotation.

The whole community is more or less infected by this feverish impatience, but this is how it works on Christian societies. Our own Church, in common with other religious communities, has become of late years keenly conscious of past shortcomings, and is animated by an earnest zeal to win to Christ the multitudes in this and other lands who are now living literally without God in the world. Against such a zeal I would be the last to protest, but must nevertheless impress upon you that if divorced from discretion it may do much harm, possibly so much as to overcome the good. "We must attract the people," is the constant cry of ministers of the Gospel at the present day. Certainly, but how? Are any means justifiable? No one in his senses would answer that question in the affirmative. So it is tacitly admitted there are means which it is neither wise nor right to employ, and we must regard them as well as the end. Now with a great number of earnest workers at the present day the means most in favour are by appealing only to the emotions. This appeal takes very diverse, sometimes antagonistic, forms. By some the results and consequences of sin are depicted in such glowing terms that the auditors are lashed into an hysterical condition, which, transitory though it be, is assumed to indicate a revolutionary change in the whole nature. By others it is thought that, by some mode of localising the divine presence on earth, the sense of reverence may be deepened, and men be less forgetful of Him. The consecrated wafer in one branch of the Catholic Church, the eucharistic rite in another, with all the attendant ideas (or superstitions, as some would call them) concerning sacred vestments, mystic rites, symbolical worship, and a miracle-working priesthood, are supposed to replace the temple and the Shechinah of the Jewish Church.

Neither of these methods are in any sense modern discoveries. The latter certainly has had a long trial, and the verdict of history is adverse to its claims. By it you may snatch a temporary victory, but you will have to pay dearly for it. Fighting the demon of infidelity with the broken crutch of superstition has not in the long run succeeded in the past, and is still less likely to do so in the future. History declares that neither method was employed by the most successful missionaries, who also worked under the greatest difficulties, I mean the Apostles and their imme-

diate followers, and that moral growth and spiritual knowledge have always been in accordance with the laws of continuity and development. Bear then these in mind. They are God's laws, and you cannot alter them. First the seed cast upon the earth, then the green blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear, and at last, when the fruit is ripe, the season of harvest. Like unto this, we are told by our Master, is the kingdom of God. Therefore be patient. Be content to work along the lines which God has prescribed. But, you may say, I want to see the fruits of my labours. A very natural feeling—I suppose every one who plants a tree would like to sit under the shadow of it—but that is not given to us. But, you may say, this neighbour of mine, by preaching a gospel of hell fire amidst a blare of trumpets, collects thousands to listen to him, and that neighbour, by the attractions of music, incense, and vestments, gets his church crowded. Well, it is not the making of proselytes, but what we make of them which matters. For that statement we have pretty good authority. But, you may say, men praise them as earnest and energetic, they will never recognise my work. Recognise your work! what does that matter. The important thing to the world is that the work should be done well, not that it should be recognised. Never mind whether you are praised, whether you may be tracked across the country by newspaper paragraphs: take care that you are not justly blamed: that is the only thing which you need mind. The pulpit of a church is not the stage of a theatre, the sphere of a parson's work is not the area of a circus, and even on these latter he is not the best actor who plays his part to the gallery. Above all, do not make the fatal mistake of supposing that good intentions will render harmless any folly. I sometimes hear it said, so-and-so is such an earnest, zealous, well-meaning man that we must not criticise or check him. I am sorry to say good intentions will not alter the natural order of events. The best intentions will not save your finger from being burnt if you put it in the fire, and all the zeal in the world will not avert the evil consequences if that zeal is wrongly directed. The words of our great dramatist have a terrible truth:—

The evil that men do lives after them,
The good is oft interred with their bones.

So long as a man of noble aims but with misdirected energies is acting as leader, that which is hurtful in his system is neutralised by his personal goodness, but when he is gone, and inferior men take his place, the evil part develops and the good withers, because the one is innate and the other adventitious. Anthony the hermit and Simeon of the pillar, Francis of Assisi and Ignatius Loyola, not to mention many others among the fathers and doctors of the Church Catholic were men of the most earnest piety and the very best intentions,

but their mistakes have borne and continue to bear a prolific crop of hurtful fruit.

Undertake, then, your work this day in the spirit of patience, in the spirit of self-abnegation, in full trust in God. Let not one word which I have spoken chill your enthusiasm. I only seek to save you from misdirecting it. Never was there a time when there was a grander task before the clergy, or when they could do more to save their country from a great catastrophe. The condition of things in England bears a very dangerous resemblance to that in France before the great revolution. Not only is there the same wide-spread poverty, the same unequal distribution of wealth; the same sundering of interests and classes; but there is the same hysteric sentimentality, the same hazy morality, the same confusion of the laws of right and wrong, as there was in that country shortly before the time when men sobbed forth maudlin platitudes about liberty and fraternity, and then went away to torture and murder those who differed from them. It is your business, as was that of the prophets of old, to tell your people in no uncertain voice that God's laws of right and wrong are immutable, and that no amount of verbose oratory or flaccid sentimentality can make a lie into truth, can ennoble a base deed, can change vile tools into honourable implements. It is your business to guide your people to a more perfect sense of the omnipresence, the omnipotence, and the omniscience of the all-loving Father, instead of leading them back towards the worship of idols and the conceptions of times of ignorance. You must be content to work on in silence, for the path which I have described will not be that of earthly fame; in unpopularity, for the prophet's task is a thankless one; in hope, for you will be only a sower of seed. But its fruit will some day ripen; you will not gather it, but others will. In life time, however, you will have this reward, that by degrees you will win the affection and confidence of many, the respect of all whose respect is worth having; and when you cease from labour, you may say, I have done what I could; it has been little, yet I did it with all my might, and so in God's hands I leave the issue. I have striven, O gracious Saviour, to tread, though at a long distance, in Thy footsteps; to work, though so imperfectly, after Thy example. Failure rather than success has seemed my lot; yet I know that truth is stronger than falsehood, that right will at last prevail over wrong, and in the light of Thy presence all evil will be consumed. The seed which I have sown has borne but little fruit in the brief span of this earthly life, but I trust yet to see a more abundant harvest in that better land where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest.

ON the feast of the Epiphany two ladies were admitted to the office of Deaconess by the Bishop of Bedford, at the parish church of Hackney.

MANKIND, THE PAST, THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE.

BY REV. HY. HARRIS DAVIES, M.A., PH.D.,
VICAR OF LLANGOED, ANGLESEA.

A SERMON PREACHED AT LLANGOED CHURCH
ON THE 1ST OF JANUARY, 1888.

"One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh; but the earth abideth for ever."—ECCLES. i. 4.

SOME of the most learned men of our day, though they are professed Christians, yet differ most wildly in their opinions concerning the commencement of time, which followed the creative acts of the Almighty in the formation of this world. The Chinese assert that they possess authentic records of the existence of the world many thousands of years anterior to the date we generally assign to it, that is, about 6,000 years ago.

But we find, that the Assyrians again, date the time of the deluge about 36,000 years before the time our chronologers have assigned to the creation of the world.

It is possible that these vast differences in the calculations and statements of different nations, might have occurred designedly through national pride and through groundless mythological traditions, or through the ignorance and the carelessness of unqualified copyists: for we find many instances of these blunders and inaccuracies on record in divers other historical matters.

The science which has created the greatest stir, if not consternation, among some of the greatest divines of our day and generation, is geology. The mysteries which have been brought to light by this science have caused great pain to many really religious people of the old orthodox creed. And when they hear some of our greatest divines fearlessly say "that worlds upon worlds and ages upon ages" existed before the creation of man, they seem bewildered, and are forced to ask, as Nicodemus asked on a different subject, "How can these things be?" This subject has not only given great pain to many religious people, but it has also, I am sorry to say, proved too great a trial to their faith, and has driven them, to say the least, to the brink of infidelity. But we do not wonder at all at this, because we know that it has always been the same with regard to every new doctrine, and every new scientific discovery. For instance, few if any, in our time, will dare deny that the sun is immoveable, and that the earth by its daily revolution upon its own axis is the cause of our day and night; and yet this doctrine caused the immortal Galileo to be publicly degraded and cast into prison, in the year 1663. I am willing to confess there are many things to be found in the Scriptures, as St. Peter tells us, "that are hard to be understood," but still I believe them, and am ready to attribute all the difficulty to my own ignorance; and if I err, I am

convinced that I err on the safe side. We find that children of the same parents do often differ widely from one another in size, talent, comeliness, and position in life, etc.; yet the parents regard each of them as their child. And it is also very much the same with regard to nations. They are only the parents of innumerable different families, and God regards them all as His children. "Have we not all," says the prophet, "one Father; hath not one God created us?"

Now, though many different nations inhabit the world, yet none of them, more than different individuals, is destined to remain here long; for, "one generation passeth away and another generation cometh."

It is recorded in history that some men have lived very long. For instance, Methuselah is said to have lived 969 years.

Pliny tells us of some men who had lived 1,000 years. We also read of some nations who have once been great in number, in valour and in fame, but they have all disappeared long, long ago, and you cannot find them now anywhere, except in the pages of history, among the things that were in the days of old.

This world is the platform of an immensely grand theatre, where many different characters appear to perform their parts, and the moment these are acted, each company and each individual retires behind the scenes, to make room for others to appear after them.

And without this diversity of scenery and character, the play would not be so full and fascinating. And thus we find also that "one generation passeth away, and another generation cometh."

1.—The first particular mentioned here is, that "one generation passeth away." And here I must remind you, that though some nations have had to continue very long in the world, yet the last news that we hear of them, as of individuals is, "and after that they died."

It appears perfectly plain, from many passages of Holy Scripture, that different nations are raised up by divine providence for some special purposes, and that as soon as these purposes have been established, according to the original plan, the same Almighty power and wisdom cause them again to disappear for ever, that other nations may succeed them. Without referring particularly at present to the seven nations who inhabited the land of Canaan before the children of Israel took possession of it, there were the Assyrians, who were considered one of the most ancient and warlike nations of the world, but they together with their magnificent cities, Babylon and Nineveh, have all been buried out of sight many centuries ago. The Jews again played a most important part at one time (and what remains for them yet to perform, God only knows); but look at their degraded state to-day! They have long lost their country "which flowed with milk and honey." No! that "land of wheat and barley, and

vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates" is theirs no longer! Their beautiful city and glorious temple have they no more! They have now become "an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword, among all the nations, whither the Lord hath led them." True it is that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will." Indeed, there is nothing abiding here, everything is on the move; "the things which are seen are temporal;" were they otherwise, then we would expect to find perfection, but alas! we know, to our sorrow, it is not so! Solomon says here that "one generation *goeth* away," but he does not tell us *how*, nor *when*.

Some nations perform wonderful works; they subdue other nations, they possess their lands, they change their system of government, and even their language, they reduce the natives to bondage, and sell them to the highest bidder, like cattle in the market! The bare mention of the names of some mighty nations, and particularly, the least incivility and threat from them, will cause others to quiver and to quake, and bow down before them to the very dust! We have a particular instance of this in the case of the great king of Assyria, when he sent Rab-shakeh and others with 581,000 armed men against Jerusalem in the days of Hezekiah, the king of Israel.

When Rab-shakeh told the watchmen upon the walls that he had come there to demolish their city, and raze it even to the foundation, and to cut off its inhabitants with the edge of the sword; when king Hezekiah heard all this, he rent his clothes, covered himself with sackcloth; he went up into the house of the Lord and cried mightily unto the Lord for deliverance from that terrible calamity! But after all the insults and cruelty heaped by one nation upon the other, yet this, like everything else in this world, is only for a time, and that time will not be very long, for "one generation passeth away."

We have often seen whole families leave their native land and emigrate to some far distant country, from which they never returned; and it is also very much the same with regard to all the nations of the earth. They are only large branches of the same human family, and all emigrating upon the sea of time to that boundless eternity which is to be their everlasting home.

Many a mighty nation that walks the earth this day "with a stretched-forth neck" (as the prophet expresses it), and considers itself all-powerful and invincible, and perhaps, our own nation amongst others, may, in the course of a few centuries hence, be swept away, and be reckoned with the past! This is God's own order with the nations of the world. And this constant change has existed from the beginning, it is daily going on, and it shall continue the same to the very end of time; "one generation passeth away."

II.—The next thing stated here is that "another generation cometh." Had all the different nations of the earth been allowed to pass away without

making any provision to replace them, the human race would have long ago disappeared from the face of the earth. But instead of that, the same divine wisdom and power that removed one generation, seem to take all the necessary care, to replace it immediately with another. When the van gets thinned, the rear is brought up to fill the gaps. And thus when the parents are taken away by death, the children succeed them, "Instead of thy fathers, shall be thy children." Some of us are the heads of families to-day, but our children will be the heads of families in a few years hence. We shall before then "have gone the way of all the earth," and shall never return.

We were young children a few years ago (it is only a span when we look back upon it), we would play and run about all the day long. If we enjoyed good health, and had plenty of food and clothing, that is all we cared for.

It was no matter to us what party or government was in power, nor what party or government was out of power. We would not care when the sun set, nor when the day dawned. But a mighty change has come over us since; our position in society is vastly different now. We are now become the heads of families. The waves of this troublesome world toss us terribly about; we sometimes "mount up to heaven, and go down again to the depths." We must now not only take care of ourselves, but also of our families; we must take care of our time and of our means, or we shall suffer the unhappy consequences.

The crowds of children that we see now filling our schoolrooms, and playing in groups in the fields and along the roads, these happy, innocent little ones will be constituting our nation in a few years hence, and not we. We shall have gone by then to "the house appointed for all living," having left our places, our works, and our goods and chattels to others; for, when we die, whether we be rich or poor, we shall carry nothing away. And thus we find that "another generation cometh."

Though countless generations have passed away since the death of righteous Abel, yet we are told that the world is more fully populated in our day than it ever was in any former age, or generation.

When some great king, general, politician, or minister of the Gospel, etc., is struck down by the hand of death, we are ready to think that one of the main springs in the machinery of this world has broken down, and that confusion and ruin must ensue. But this is an error, for, notwithstanding the number of bright angelic geniuses that have appeared and disappeared from time to time, yet the world seems to be going on as regularly this day as though they had never been! and thus "another generation cometh." Though all the water with which all our hills and dales are supplied has come at first out of the sea, the sea does not appear in any degree the more empty, and that because the water runs back again into the sea

whence it came. And so "the waters shall never fail from the sea." And so also it can be said with regard to all the generations of men. Though so many countless millions have disappeared in death, yet their absence is not an irretrievable loss, for, "another generation cometh."

The first commandment that God delivered to mankind was this: "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth." And as long as human nature will remain the same, there is no danger that the nations will ever fail, as long as the world shall endure.

There are two great passages connected with this world—one of these is birth, and the other is death. And though death, like some impassable gulf, swallows up everything that is cast into it, and is seen no more; yet birth incessantly opens the door of existence to let others in. And thus it will continue, as long as the world shall exist. This is God's order, and therefore it cannot fail.

III.—The last particular mentioned here is that "the earth abideth for ever." Now, in the account which Moses has given us of the creation of the world, we read thus:—"In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved unto the face of the waters." All modern divines of note, as well as geologists, conclude from this, that the earth was in existence previous to the time which Moses speaks of here, but that it was then in a confused, disordered state.* And instead of creating the earth then, that God only arranged its different constituent parts, and brought them into harmony and order, as we now behold them. Hence it is believed that the elementary particles, or the essences of all things, must have existed, if not from eternity, yet from an inconceivably remote period; and that the earth and all therein shall continue eternally, or abide for ever. There is only one verse in the New Testament (and I am not aware of any in the Old Testament), that bears directly upon what some call the final destruction of this world, and it is this:—"The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." Now, by this, we may understand, not that the earth shall be annihilated or reduced to nothing, but that it shall be purified with fire, so far as sin has affected it, and after that it shall continue for ever, as a monument of the almighty wisdom and power of God, and as a theme of wonder and admiration to all the glorified saints and the angels of heaven. And with this idea the following verse seems to agree: "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

And now in conclusion, let us all bear in mind that we, like all others, are passing away with inconceivable speed, and God only knows how soon we shall reach our journey's end, and then disappear, and be no more seen!

Time rapid flies, none can impede its pace;
Empires and kingdoms flourish and decay:
One common lot awaits the human race;
All in succession shall be swept away.

"Oh, that we were wise, that we understood this,
that we would consider our latter end!"



THE installation of the Dean-designate of Rochester (Canon Hole) is expected to take place on Candlemas Day. The *Maidstone Journal* says that the Canon has one only son, who has just finished his University course, and whose height is 6ft. 4in.

THE Ven. Benjamin Philpot, of Surbiton, completed his ninety-eighth year on Monday last. Mr. Philpot graduated at Cambridge in 1812, and was ordained the year of Waterloo. He was formerly Vicar-General of the Isle of Man, and Archdeacon of that see.

WE are glad to announce that the Ven. Alfred Earle, Archdeacon of Totnes, has been selected as the new suffragan of London, and will bear the title of Bishop of Guildford. By an arrangement with the Drapers' Company he will be presented to the rectory of St. Michael's, Cornhill. Mr. Earle's name was presented by the Bishop of London, accompanied by that of Prebendary Sandford, vicar of Cornwood, Devon, the law requiring two to be submitted to the Crown. He is the only son of the late Mr. W. Earle, of Hungerhall Park, Tunbridge Wells, and was born about the year 1832. He was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, where he obtained a Lusby Scholarship, and graduated in 1854. He was ordained by Bishop Hamilton, of Salisbury, in 1858, and was the Gospeller on that occasion. He was curate of St. Edward's, Salisbury, till 1863, when he was collated by Bishop Hamilton to the rectory of Monkton Farleigh, Wilts. In 1865 he was presented to the united benefices of West Alvington, Marlborough, South Milton, and South Huish, in the diocese of Exeter, by the Dean and Chapter of Salisbury. He was made Archdeacon of Totnes by Bishop Temple in 1872, and subsequently Examining Chaplain. The present Bishop of Exeter collated him to the canonry of Exeter, and continued him as Examining Chaplain. In 1867 he married at Halifax, Nova Scotia, Miss Alice Margaret Harvey, third daughter of Mr. R. C. Harvey, of Bermuda. The *Western Morning News* says his removal will be a great loss to the diocese of Exeter:—"Since his appointment to the Archdeaconry of Totnes, he was, next to the Bishop, the most important figure in the Church throughout Devon and Cornwall; and, since he has been Canon of Exeter, he has bestowed all his energies upon diocesan, Mission, and other work. For some years he has been at the head of the Church of England Temperance Society in the diocese, and two years ago was selected to preach the annual sermon of the Society in London. Archdeacon Earle also took a prominent part in the social purity movement. He may be described as a moderate High Churchman."

* Quem dixere chaos rudis indigestaque Moles.—OVID.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA.
COUGHS, COLDS, CONSUMPTION,
 and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly **CURED**
 by simply using the

AMMONIAPHONE

FOR THE **Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.**

21s. post free. WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had on application to **Medicine Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
 Corner of Rabbittone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 14, 1888.

IRISH CHURCH PROSPECTS IN 1888.

(Communicated.)

WHEN Mr. Gladstone produced his plan, founded on false history, for the plunder of the Irish Church, and its degradation to the level of Romish and Protestant Dissenting bodies, he was backed up by the Ritualistic organs in England. They, the Irish churchmen, were no better than Orange Protestants. Away with them! We in Ireland hoped that our freedom from Ritualistic doctrines and ceremonies would have gained us some mercy even from English Protestant Dissenters. But no! They and Irish Romanists had formed an alliance, offensive and defensive; and the Irish Church, no matter what it taught or did, must go, as an outwork of that of England. And the Ritualists of England said, Down with it! down with it! even to the ground. Having thus done all that Satan or man could do against the Irish Church, a change has now come over their views. They will try to make use of it. A plan has been formed, I will not say a treaty, either with Rome or the Ritualists, for the Poperising of the Irish Church. We will explain the plan. We will give our proofs afterwards. Every Protestant home and cabin in Ireland is to be entered by a weekly Church paper, price 1d. This paper is to have the sanction of the Bishops. In fact, it is to be an Episcopal utterance. It has already taught Popery. It is now to refuse to reopen the Popish question. These are serious and distinct charges. We now proceed to establish them. The only weekly Irish Clerical paper hitherto cost 3d. It was proposed to bring it, by a penny charge, within the reach of the poorest.

The paper said plainly, a short time ago, that such reduction was impossible unless its circulation was increased threefold. Now the reduction is made as the year opens. A threefold increase of circulation in Ireland is impossible. In Ireland it must rather decrease. Whence do the needful funds come? It must be from England. The editor, indeed, boasted that his Popish teaching was gaining him subscribers here, especially in Oxford. He publishes letters plainly to that effect. We have thus shown how every cabin is to be entered. No one will grudge 1d. a week! Next we come to the Episcopal *imprimatur*. The editor gives the names of all the Irish Bishops, except two. What authority he has we know not. But, till they repudiate, we must take the patronage for granted. Next we come to the doctrines of this paper. It stated lately that it would not allow the question of the Presence to be re-opened, even so far as to say, "What is the difference between a spiritual presence and a virtual presence?" When asked to refer inquirer to the date when, in its columns, the question was discussed, it treated the question with silent contempt. Well, then, as the question of the Presence is not to be re-opened, it becomes a serious matter of inquiry, What was the decision which is not now to be disturbed? The rulings are according to Trent, as plain as words can speak. We will prove this both by editorial utterances and by letters, without caveat of Editor. We have a right to argue from letters, because the editor says every week that he will only admit what is legitimately consonant to our formularies. Well, then, what do we read on April 23rd, 1887? That the Almighty Creator of the Universe is present in the elements! This is Trent all over. Our Lord's Body and Blood, Trent says, soul and divinity, are present under the species of bread and wine. We will quote the very words of Ap. 23. They, the Ritualistic Irish clergy, "are assailed with the slanderous epithets of crypto-Romanists and surpliced traitors, because they reverently shrink from making the Almighty Creator of the Universe the slave of the limits which condition a material clod." This is strange divinity, that the Universe was created by our Lord's manhood, for it is *that* that is limited by the 4th Article and the Black Rubric. It is nonsense to say that we limit the Almighty, as it is only the manhood that we so bind to one place. This is the divinity which must not now be questioned! On February 19th we had another farago of contradictions. First, we were told that the Black Rubric was foisted into the Prayer-book in 1662; and that "it has no binding force whatsoever." And then the writer falls to embracing what he had before kicked. "It is an excellent Rubric and a great support, inasmuch as it virtually enjoins adoration." All this groundless flattery is built on a change of a word in the restored Rubric, though any one of common sense knows that

"corporal" of 1662 has exactly the same sense as "real and bodily" and "real and essential" of Edward's Article and Rubric. This paper denies that it holds a local or corporal presence. But this is all talk. It holds all that Rome does, that is, all but a coarse Copernaitic presence, which clothes our Lord's Body with all the accidents of real flesh. Nothing else does this paper abjure. It *must* hold a local corporal presence, for there is no other conceivable, except it be a spiritual presence, as Ridley said of spirit and grace. But this, under the name of Virtualism, it, like Rome, denounces as heretical. A local corporal presence it does and must hold. We have proved our point that Popery is taught, and is not now to be questioned. We might tell how, on December 4th, 1886, it was declared that the adoration of a local or corporal presence "is fairly based on Scripture." We might tell how, on January 8th, 1887, it was stated that our Lord's Body may be in ninety places at once; and that this interpretation is claimed by members of our own communion, thus repudiating the defence put forward, that all that was meant by "fairly based on Scripture" was, that there should be charity for Romanists, and that immorality is worse than heterodoxy. We might go on quoting from this paper. But what profit? If we have not said enough, nothing will convince people. These are the rulings, which are not to be disputed. As King James II. said, he would not allow the Presence to be discussed. A paper which enters every Irish cabin, unless it will re-open the Presence question, leaves the people exposed to Popery. If the priest shows them out of the Irish weekly that a local presence "in ninety places at once is to be adored," and that this adoration is taught by our Rubric, what is to save them from Popery, except a re-opening of the Presence question, in an anti-Popish sense. The people are to be given up to the priests, and their only weekly will not re-open the question. So the event must follow. When once the weak place in the walls was shown to the besiegers by "the ninety places at once," and the adoration "fairly based on Scripture," all the traitors within require is to refuse to do anything to strengthen the weak place. The agreement between the withouts and the withins seems perfect! This is the paper which all Irish Bishops but two are paraded as the patrons of. This is the paper which, by means of English money, is now to be sent into every Protestant cabin in Ireland. What a report may Persico send to Rome! If Walsh, Croke, and Nulty sat beside the editor, what more could they say than that adoration of a body present in ninety places at once is fairly based on Scripture? What more than that this adoration is virtually enjoined by our formularies? What more than that the words of the Article and Rubric put limits on the omnipresent Creator of the Universe? What more can all this rubbish need, when it enters

every cabin, than this, that it has the sanction of almost the whole Episcopacy? All is complete—the Popery, not to be questioned—the Episcopalian sanction—the nominal price, which is to admit it to the very lowest stratum of the Protestant peasantry. If England can aid her helpless sister, let her do so at once. The poison is being spread. Not a moment is to be lost. If Ireland cannot herself get up a rival weekly organ which will re-open the Popish decisions, we in England will always allow the warning to come from us. We will not be deaf to the cry of afflicted Protestantism, "Come over and help us." We have many other features to give of the state of things in the Irish Church and University, but space fails us, and we must defer them till a further opportunity.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCHES.

A PAPER READ AT A CLERICAL MEETING BY THE
REV. BROWNLOW MAITLAND, Nov., 1887.

THE motive which has induced me to invite discussion on this subject, is to be found in some remarkable proceedings which occurred in the Lower House of our Southern Convocation during its sessions in the present year. A committee of distinguished divines, selected from different schools of thought, had been appointed to draft some questions and answers about the Church, of such a kind as to be a suitable addition or appendix to the Catechism; and they took the opportunity of the spring session to present the result of their labours to the House for its approval. Naturally, they began with a definition of the Church, that the Catechumen's tender mind might be furnished with an idea of the thing meant, before being led on to its attributes, relations, and claims. So far the committee probably expected matters to go smoothly enough, and great I imagine must have been their surprise to find their proposed answer to the question—"What meanest thou by the word Church?"—greeted by a din of dissentient voices. Hammer and tongs the august assembly went at it, and the air was thick with amendments and counter-amendments; till after eight hours of animated but exhausting conflict, an amended definition was at last adopted by a small minority of the members, who still retained strength enough to record their votes; the consideration of the remainder of the draft being deferred to the next group of sessions. But the most curious incident was yet to come. The postponed questions and answers having been largely debated and finally settled by the House when it met again with recovered vigour, the definition of the Church which had been brought forth with such prolonged and severe labour-pangs was subjected to fresh manipulation, on the ground of the great dissatisfaction it had occasioned; and in this process of second birth it suffered so severely, that scarcely half of it survived to be reported to the House of Bishops.

It is this remarkable story which has led me to think that the meanings or uses of the term "Church" may be a suitable subject for discussion in our little Convocation here: and I have accordingly undertaken to introduce it with such remarks as will be

sufficient—I do not say to elucidate it—but to set the discussion on foot.

There can be no doubt, I imagine, of the propriety of beginning the inquiry from the historical side.

Looking back to the origin of Christianity, we find that in Jerusalem, on the very day of the promised descent of the Holy Spirit upon the little company of adherents which the ascended Christ had left behind him in the world, the preaching of the Apostles issued in the formation of a society of persons who professed faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, and in token thereof received baptism into His name; and that this society became known as the Church. It is true that the word Church, applied to it in the Authorised Version of Acts ii. 47, is an interpolation; but in Acts v. and thenceforth, we find the name so applied. Unquestionably, therefore, in the very commencement of Christianity, the Church was the visible congregation and fellowship, formed in Jerusalem, of the believers in Christ.

It was not long before similar societies came into existence in other cities or towns in Palestine, alike in Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee; and to each of these the same term, Church, was applied. It may be noticed that whereas once these Palestinian communities are classed together as one in the phrase "The Church throughout all Judæa and Galilee and Samaria," according to the text followed by the revisers, in other cases they are spoken of as so many separate Churches. St. Paul, for instance, twice mentions the Churches in or of Judæa alone, thus viewing even those closely neighbouring bodies as distinct communities.

When, through the rapid extension of Christianity, similar bodies of believers were formed in the chief cities and towns throughout the Roman empire, to each of these the name Church was given, just as much as to the original society in Jerusalem. Even when many such societies existed within a single province, their separate individuality continued to be recognised. Thus we hear of the Churches of Syria and Cilicia, the Churches of Macedonia, the Churches of Galatia, the Churches of the Asiatic province.

The picture, then, of primitive Christianity presented to us in the New Testament is that of a vast number of distinct local Churches, or societies of believers in Christ; spiritually associated, indeed, by a common faith and hope, but individually complete and independent of each other. Once we hear of the original Church at Jerusalem in a manner legislating for the infant Gentile Churches in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia; but that was by special invitation, and was never repeated, nor did the decree retain any lasting authority. Each Church, in fact, managed its own affairs, under more or less apostolic guidance; and as the Palestinian Churches found an external bond of connection in the apostles resident at Jerusalem, so did the Gentile Churches in St. Paul, the founder of many of them, and the practical superintendent of them all. To all intents and purposes these primitive Churches were distinct, independent, co-ordinate bodies, in communion with each other, but none possessing authority over another.

It was inevitable that a development should soon begin out of this primitive stage of independence towards one of coalescence and confederation. Accordingly, as episcopacy became general, local Churches, headed by their bishops, united themselves for purposes of government and discipline with Churches of districts and provinces; and the larger bodies thus formed again coalesced, after the manner

of a confederation between independent states, and grew at last into a single society, with representative œcumenical councils as its organ of legislation. But the organic unity thus attained was short-lived, as was to be expected. Portions of the society soon broke off and went their own way, forming independent Churches, to which the stigma of heresy was more or less attached by the main body. Then followed the great rupture between eastern and western Christendom; and some centuries later came the splitting up of the latter at the Reformation, initiating a process of disintegration which is still running its course.

What appears to follow from this brief historical review, in which we are regarding the Church as an institution existing in the world and composed of living human beings, is this: that a Church is a society of believers in Christ, membership of it being formally acquired by baptism; and that the Church, the word being taken absolutely, is simply the aggregate of all such societies, or of their members, existing in the world at any given time. This aggregate may be itself an organised body, but is not so of necessity, and, in fact, never has been so, except for a short period, under really œcumenical councils, the legislative authority of which was acknowledged by all the Christians of the time. That is, the general term, "The visible Church," is a term of classification, representing the sum total of co-existing local, particular, or national Churches; and it has its analogue in such a term as mankind, which gathers under one conception all the separate varieties and families of the human race:—not in such terms as nation or tribe, which connote organic unity and internal cohesion. In other words, whereas visible Churches are coherent, organised bodies or societies of living human beings, who have been baptised into the faith of Christ, the term "visible Church" is historically a generic name, under which all such bodies or societies are classed together, as being essentially of the same genus, whatever their specific, non-essential differences may be.

The two things to be specially borne in mind, to escape confusion, seem to be these: First, that when we pass from speaking of the various particular Churches of Christendom to grouping them together under one term, as the visible, catholic, or universal Church, the word Church undergoes a considerable change of significance, since the ideas of visible unity, organic coherence, legislative and defining authority, which are connoted in the former use, cannot be carried on to the latter use without violence to history and fact. And, secondly, that the essential relation of particular Churches to each other is not an external or visible, but a spiritual one,—the relation arising out of a common faith and hope, a common inheritance in Christ, a unity of the spirit, not of ecclesiastical organisation.

It may be added here, that this relation between the Church and the Churches seems to be recognised, point for point, in our Anglican Articles, which never use the word Church except of a visible body of living human beings. They define the visible Church as "a congregation (*cætus*) of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same;" where the term "congregation" evidently means the entire company of the faithful, *i.e.*, of Christians dispersed throughout the whole world, just as the term "congregation of Israel," whence it is borrowed, was equivalent to the sum total of living

Israelites. Within this visible Church the Articles recognise the existence of particular and national Churches, each having its own independent power of self-government within the limits laid down in Scripture. According to Article XXI, the independence of particular churches is so absolute, that it is not over-ridden even by the authority of general councils; for in that Article the Anglican Church, so far from submitting implicitly to whatever may be decreed by a general council, takes on itself to sit in the seat of judgment, to call general councils to its bar, and to pronounce not only that they may err, but that they have actually erred, in things pertaining to God. A stronger assertion of the independence of particular churches can scarcely be imagined, for how can they be bound by any external ecclesiastical authority if even the sentences of general councils cannot *ipso facto* bind them?

But after all this has been said, no one will suppose that the bottom of the subject has been reached. The use of the term "visible Church" in the Articles, implies the existence of a church of which visibility is not predicable. Twice in our Liturgy we hear of a "mystical Body of Christ," defined in one case as "the blessed company of all faithful people," in the other as "the communion and fellowship of God's elect;" and although in neither instance is the term Church applied to this body, Scripture leaves us in no doubt that it may be so applied, *i.e.*, may be applied to a body which is manifestly not identical with the visible Church. Again, out of the visible Church true believers pass by death, yet they do not cease to belong to that body of Christ which is certainly in some sense the Church, so that there must be for them a Church which is other than that on earth. The language of Scripture, too, suggests the same conclusion. Our Lord, indeed, evidently speaks of a visible body of believers exercising discipline over its members, when He bids a disciple who has an unredressed grievance against a fellow-disciple to "tell it to the Church." But His use of the term on another occasion raises before our minds a wider vision; I mean in the great declaration, "Upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." Hades is the prison-house of the dead; its gates close over men as they depart from this life, and pass into the invisible world. But it shall not prevail against the Church. Surely this promise must be more than an assurance that the losses of the *visible* Church by deaths shall always be sufficiently repaired by the addition of new members, to keep it from dwindling away to extinction! It is not the Church as a visible corporation, or aggregate of such corporations, that is the object of Christ's redeeming work, but the members of it to whom He gives eternal life. Apply the assurance to them, and it is lifted out of the earthly region. What it then declares is, to use the interpretation of the Speaker's Commentary, "that the prison of the dead shall have no power to retain the members of Christ's Church, who by His redemption shall be rescued from it and be united with Him in His glorious kingdom;" or, in the words of the Easter-eve collect, that "through the grave and gate of death they shall pass to their joyful resurrection." But if so; if Christ is assuring His Church of a safe and triumphant passage through death into His glory, it is clear that what He here means by the Church must be different from the visible institution which bears that name in the world. The continuous existence of this by means of an un-

ceasing accession of new members to replace the dead, has nothing in common with the future triumph of the deceased members over the power of death.

Still clearer to my mind is it that St. Paul, in his loftiest language concerning the Church, cannot be speaking merely of that aggregate of living Christians which makes up the visible Church. That Church which is the Body of Christ, and the headship of which makes Him to be head over all things; that Church into which God so infuses Himself that it becomes the *pleroma*, the fulness, of Him who filleth all in all; that Church for which Christ gave Himself, as for His bride, that He might present it to Himself, a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; that Church through which the manifold wisdom of God is made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places, and glory accrues to the Eternal Father, unto all generations, for ever and ever; cannot surely be identified with any congregation of living men, qualified by the admixtures and imperfections which cleave to the best of visible Churches! Such descriptions lift us out of the region of experience, and bid us seek their subject in the eternal purposes of God.

But this ultimate Church, if I may so call it, this Church against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail, this Church which is the everlasting Body and Bride of Christ, and in its perfection as the *pleroma* of Deity shall manifest to all ages the divine wisdom and grace—How shall it be defined?

I turn to Hooker, as the most generally accepted master of Anglican theology, and find him clearly distinguishing it from the visible Church. This he describes as the aggregate of all living persons, who, by external profession are Christians. But the other he calls Christ's body mystical, which cannot "be sensibly discerned by any man, inasmuch as the parts thereof are some in heaven already with Christ, and the rest that are on earth (albeit their natural persons be visible), we do not discern under that property whereby they are truly and infallibly of that body." "It consisteth," he adds, "of none but only true Israelites, true sons of Abraham, true servants and saints of God."

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

FUNERAL REFORM.

SIR,—It is time that the lesson taught by the Funeral Reform Association should be taken home by Englishmen generally. This lesson received with real attention of mind and pondered over, will bring to all who read it a sense of unspeakable relief. The association started with the purpose of dealing with the gross abuses of the modern system of burial:—its danger to the public health; its inordinate, and for the multitude, ruinous costliness. But in such an enterprise as this a society often finds itself committed to action on a larger scale than was at first thought of. The association has already done much:—some evils have perhaps been removed; some have been lessened: but it cannot yet be said that the foundations of funeral reform have been laid so that they cannot be shaken. The conviction which would deal a

death blow to funeral abuses has not yet been brought home to the minds, or rather hearts, of Englishmen. Englishmen generally do not know what they mean when they speak of the resurrection of the dead, or, the resurrection of the body; and the Bishops and others who have given the sanction of their names to the Funeral Reform Association now come forward to tell them what at least these terms do *not* mean. They say plainly that after the change which we call death the living agent who had made use of that which we call the body has nothing further—now or hereafter—to do with the material particles (if the words must be used) which he has laid aside, and by so saying they have struck at the roots of the misbelief on which the whole system of modern funerals rests. This mischief frames for itself pictures of a bringing together, and resuscitation of relics of which Mediæval and other painters have left us abundant illustrations; and the preservation of relics becomes generally an object of secret desire or longing, and sometimes a passion. Hence, really, the love of double or triple coffins lined with armour plating: hence the horrid multiplication of bricked graves and still more of those charnel-houses of corruption and filth popularly known as vaults. Hence, further, the gross perversion of thought which cannot get away from the bondage of material particles; and hence, finally, the petrification of the spiritual life by associations connected with graves. The terrible mischief thus done can only be met by the question, “Why seek ye the living among the dead?” and until the people can be made to feel that he whom they love is not in a coffin or a trench but is risen, it is really too much to expect that undertakers will, as a body, come forward to expose the mistakes or follies of their employers. I frankly confess my own debt of deep gratitude to the Rev. F. Lawrence, the Hon. Sec. of the Association, for the straightforward way in which he has spoken upon the subject, and I am thankful that the programmes of the society seem to speak with equal plainness. The scattering of the misbelief which hinders or retards the achievement of their work will, when it is accomplished, be felt as a deliverance from a crushing night-mare. The veil will be removed from men's eyes, and they shall see that not of physical death or of physical resurrection are the words spoken, “Verily I say unto you, the hour cometh and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.”

GEORGE W. COX.

Scrayingham Rectory,
January 4th, 1888.

THE EPIPHANY COLLECT.

SIR,—Many of your clerical readers may have taken the adoration of the Magi as an Epiphany subject. Some, possibly, may try to explain astronomically the “Star of Bethlehem.” The wiser plan is not to go too deeply into it. A star of lesser magnitude brought near to earth, would be presented as so large an object, and its light would extend so far, that it would be impossible to take it as an index over the lowly Bethlehem; but a luminous appearance may well be conceived as moving along, first as the guide to the Magi, secondly resting over the very spot “where the infant Redeemer lay”; and such might be called a star in common language. The Epiphany

collect, however, is more in my mind in addressing you, sir, than the various views regarding the “Star of Bethlehem.” This collect is one of many others in which the marvellous piety and grasp of Christian belief on the part of the compilers comes out; the laying aside of His glory and the resumption of it when the Redeemer's work was done, are beautifully indicated in a few lines. But this is not all. Believers in the exalted Redeemer pray that, “after this life we may have the fruition of His glorious Godhead.” This thought naturally connects itself with the Resurrection body. May I direct the attention of your readers to a sermon of Paley's on 1 John iii. 2. The subject is treated with Paley's lucid reasoning and chastened feeling. I do not think any reasonable man will dispute Paley's view; while many preachers who take a very materialistic view of the Resurrection body, and offend their hearers who have enough scientific knowledge to disbelieve such notions, may find some good reasons for thinking differently, without losing any of their faith in those words, “With God all things are possible,” and more faith in His own revelation, as given in 1 Cor. xv., reasonably understood.

A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, January 6th, 1888.

UNION OF PARTIES IN THE REVISION SYNOD.

SIR,—All I meant as to “union of parties” was that the Broad party helped the Low to try to bring in an alternate form of Baptism which would not assert regeneration; and that the Low helped the Broad to get rid of “It is necessary to believe rightly the Incarnation,” etc.; the division lists prove these two points, and that is all I meant. That men so voted is plain. Why they did so they know best, and I do not pretend to say.

It is useless charging me with slandering the Low or Broad members of the Revision Synod. Equally useless calling upon any of the High party to speak out. People know themselves why they hold their tongues. All I have to do is to ask a plain question or two. Why did the Broad party consent to strike regeneration out of the Baptismal Service, as if it meant conversion, when they knew it did not? And why did the Low party consent to eliminate from the Athanasian Creed “the necessity of believing rightly the Incarnation,” when they held such necessity as strongly as the High party, who fought for its retention? Let these questions be answered, and we need not talk of a treaty offensive and defensive between parties. Acts are more important than verbal or paper treaties. There is no use in getting angry, or quoting men's names. Votes are stern facts, which clamour cannot undo.

EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.

THE ROYAL PATRONAGE OF PRIZE-FIGHTING.—Mr. Labouchere, M.P., states in the columns of *Truth*, that “the Prince of Wales and his set are furious that publicity should have been given to the visit which he paid to Sullivan's boxing exhibition. It was expressly stipulated that this private show-off, before Royalty, should be kept quite secret, and fervent promises were made by the pugilist's associates that they would not let the function transpire. However, as

might have been expected, a visit from the Prince of Wales was too good an advertisement to be suppressed, and the sporting papers received information of it directly H.R.H. had left, and there has been plenty of chatter and clatter on the subject among those who were directly connected with the affair." It may easily be believed that the Prince and his *entourage* are annoyed—not at what they have done—but at the unintended and unexpected publicity, and consequent public indignation which have resulted. And this raises the query—whether other questionable exhibitions may have received the successfully secret patronage of Royalty, unknown to the public and the press? But in connection with this particular matter of prize-fighting, or professional bruising, which has just been favoured with the Prince's approval, it is instructive to note the event which occurred about a week subsequently. A party of about a hundred Englishmen, of all classes, proceeded secretly from this country to France, and there, on an island in the river Seine, managed to secure the unmolested occurrence of a most brutal prize-fight, on December 19th. The tickets for the trip, including admission and guidance, were sold at prices running from £10 to £50 each. More than fifteen English lords and other men of title and rank were noticed amongst the company. After 106 "rounds" of blows by the two combatants, the darkness of night put a stop to the further continuance of the fight, which was then, by mutual consent, declared to be a drawn battle. And it was indeed time that the brutal proceedings should be terminated, owing to the condition of both parties concerned. One of them had his ear so injured that it swelled "to the size of an egg." But at length it burst, relieving him of most acute pain. The right eye of the other fighter was "banged up." In addition, the bodies of both were heavily bruised and knocked backwards and forwards. Altogether the exhibition was a most disgusting one, in addition to its being so utterly illegal on British soil, that its actors had to skulk into a foreign island, in the twilight, in order to indulge their low tastes. It is earnestly to be hoped that never again may the patronage of British Royalty be extended, either secretly or publicly, to the "bruising" confraternity and their nasty practices.

THE programme at the re-opening of Southwell Cathedral on Candlemas Day has been published. At 9 the Archbishop of Canterbury will reopen the choir, and will celebrate the Holy Communion. At 11.15 there will be a service of praise and thanksgiving, with a sermon by the Bishop of Lichfield. At 3 p.m. there will be evensong in the nave, with a sermon by the Bishop of Salisbury.

THE Rev. Robert Eden, vicar of Old St. Pancras, has issued an appeal for funds wherewith to improve and slightly enlarge his church. The present building, which was enlarged and recased with stones taken from the old tower in 1848, is supposed to have been erected about the year 1380, and it is believed that it stands on the site of one that dated far back into pre-Norman times. It is said to have been the last church in England in which the Latin Mass was said, and the old altar-stone is still in the church. Many Roman Catholics, and among them one or more members of the Norfolk and other noble families, such as the Arundells of Wardour, the Dillons, the Cliffords of Chudleigh, and the Petres, and a number of French refugees of the last century, lie buried in the church

and churchyard. Not a few other persons of note have been interred here, such as Jeremiah Collier, who was consecrated Bishop by the non-jurors in 1713, and became afterwards head of the party known as the "Usagers," the Chevalier d'Eon, John Walker, author of the *Pronouncing Dictionary*, Pascal de Paoli, the Corsican. Mr. Eden's address is 58, Oakley Square, N.W.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Brighton-James, Rev. William James, Curate of Ironbridge; Rector of North Piddle, Worcester.
 Cox, Rev. T. Graham, M.A., late Curate of Bury, Lancashire; Curate-in-Charge of the Mission Church and District of St. Barnabas's, Chester.
 Davenport, Rev. George Devereux, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Stephen's, Launceston.
 Earle, Ven. Archdeacon, Rector of St. Michael's, Cornhill.
 Egremont, Rev. H. E., Chaplain of Rummelsberg.
 Ellwood, Rev. Robert Gilbert, Rector of Staunton-on-Wye, Hereford.
 Fletcher, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Shrewsbury; Vicar of Oswestry.
 Gordon, Rev. Charles James, Vicar of Nassington-with-Yarwell, Northants.
 Grigson, Rev. F. D., B.A., East London Missionary.
 Hacking, Rev. Egbert, Rector of Eyam, Derbyshire, Incumbent of St. James's, Derby.
 Highmore, Rev. Philip Alderton, B.A., Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist, Harlow, Essex.
 Jamieson, Rev. J., Awdry, Rector of Leonard's-on-Sea.
 Jordan, Rev. Albert, M.A., late Senior Curate of Ebbw Vale; Curate-in-Charge of St. John's, Gowerion, parish of Loughor, Swansea.
 Keith-Chalmers, Rev. Robert James Douglas, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Burwardsley, Cheshire.
 Lewis, Rev. W. J., Curate of St. Margaret's, Leicester; Vicar of St. Peter's, Mount Sorrel, Loughborough.
 Lee, Rev. Robert Elton, M.A., Vicar of Stanford-in-the-Vale, Berks.
 M'Dougall, Rev. Archibald Blair, M.A., Oxon, Curate of All Saints, Clifton; Minor Canon of Ely Cathedral.
 Morris, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Strete: Vicar of Marston, Oxford.
 Patrick, Rev. J. A., M.A., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
 Price, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Selly Oak; Vicar of Claverdon-with-Norton Lindsey, Warwick.
 Salt, Rev. W. J., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of the New District of St. Saviour's, Chiddingstone Causeway, Edenbridge, Kent.
 Spencer, Rev. Abraham, M.A., Curate of Steeple Aston, Oxfordshire; Vicar of St. Mary and All Saints, Goodshaw, near Rawtenstall.
 Taylor, Rev. G. L., M.A., East London Missionary.
 Taylor, Rev. Richard Hunsley, B.A., Chaplain of the Leeds General Infirmary; Vicar of Cleasby, near Darlington.
 Valling, Rev. J. F., Curate of Hythe, Kent; Vicar of Sopley, near Bournemouth.
 Wickham, Rev. Latham, M.A., Vicar of Isacoed, Wrexham.
 Winter, Rev. Seneca William; Vicar of Podington, Wellingborough.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Collyer, Rev. H. De C., M.A., Curate-in-Charge, at St. Cyprian's Parsonage, Brockley, on the 4th inst.
 David, Rev. John Powis, M.A., Rector of Penyclawdd and Llan-goven, Monmouthshire, at the Rectory, on the 6th inst., aged 42.
 Davies, Rev. D. G., M.A., Vicar of St. Katharine's, and Surrogate for the Diocese of Llandaff, at Myrtle Villa, Pont-y-pridd, on the 18th ult., aged 41.
 Duckworth, Rev. Robert, M.A., Head Master of St. Peter's School, Weston-super-Mare, at Dawlish, suddenly, on the 31st ult., aged 59.
 Harris, Rev. John J. W., Rector of Clenchwarton, at Clenchwarton, on the 5th inst.
 Feek, Rev. Ashleigh Meigh, Rector of Adwick-le-Street, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 4th inst., aged 31.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DAWN AND THE DAY STAR.

A SERMON BY THE REV. PHILIP DWYER, M.A.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. MARY'S CHURCH,
TRIANGLE, HALIFAX, NOV. 27TH, 1887.

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts. Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."—2 PETER, i. 19, etc.

THE certainty of prophecy is here laid down as the ground of our duty in respect of it. As it is "a sure word," so we "do well to take heed to it." It is not like the sophisticated myths, or "cunningly devised fables," which grew with the growth of nations, and in which they personified their ruling passions, and deified their deliverers and heroes.

And prophecy holds a higher rank than even the best attested and most authentic of all known and accredited revelations, or the most sublime and significant parts of the same. As to its credibility, it transcends even the Transfiguration of the Lord Jesus Christ, in the calm estimate of St. Peter, who had been ear-witness and a spectator "of His majesty, when there came such a voice to Him from the most excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Yet even than this (the *Bathcol*, or Daughter of the Voice, as the Jews called it, so rarely heard and so convincing an attestation), "we have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed."

2. As, in respect of the Majesty divine of the Author and Finisher of our faith (for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy), and of the truthfulness of the testimony pointing out Him to be such in His essence, such also yet to shine forth in the splendour of His Epiphany (all which on the Mount of Transfiguration was foreshadowed). So also, in respect of the urgent needs of the Church, and as a matter of self-defence to all Christian people, the duty is evident and the obligation urgent. Accordingly, again it is pressed upon them that "ye do well to take heed unto it as unto a light shining in a dark place." And St. John adds a high encomium too, for those that read and keep it.

Vol. XXV.—No. 630.

Have any of you, let it be asked, ever gone upon the deck of an ocean steamship, and walked to the wheel-house, or pilotage. There you may have seen just a single lamp, with its steady light turned full upon the course marked out, and upon the compass that tells the points and the bearings. These the steersman ever peers into and duly consults. And onward speeds the good ship, through cloud, and storm, and foam, driving boldly into the inky darkness of the wildest night. Suchlike is "the prophetic word" to the Church in her venturesome career. On this ye rely; to this, O Christian voyagers, ye look; by this ye steer your course; and in this "ye do well," as many a saint of God in every age can witness—from Enoch to Abraham, from David to Isaiah, from Daniel to Malachi.

3. But if this "light in a dark place" is sure in its guiding power, and most needful for the Church to follow, so it is also limited. Its nature and end and use is not to turn night into day, but only to be "a light in a dark place"—just so much and no more. To the same effect our Apostle defines prophecy in his former Epistle: "Of which salvation, the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify; when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow; unto whom it was revealed that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister those things which are now reported unto us by them that have preached the Gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, which things the angels desire to look into." Now, most assuredly, this example proposed to us, of prophets, Apostles, and of the very angels of God in glory, may suffice to teach how caution must restrain curiosity, and modesty qualify our importunity of insight. And the manner indicated of our using this "light in a dark place" is decisive as to its limited power of introducing us into the realms of the future, and landing us upon the critical reality of "the end of all things." "Knowing this first (as a fundamental axiom) that no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation, that is to say—of self-solution: God alone knows the end from the beginning. We do not, and never can, open out the future without the key as well as the lock put into our hands, and in turning the key aright. What He may please to impart of history anticipated, and to have it written beforehand for our learning, and committed to us, that "we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, may have hope"—all this we are bound "to give heed unto," not as though becoming prophets, nor even "sons of the prophets." All that we are, at best, is only students of limited capacities, and passengers in the midst of dangers, with duties

to be done, and helps to be had, so far as they go, and no farther. So that thus, while human sagacity may dive into the future, and forecast the results of causes obscure or unconsidered (as when Edmund Burke anticipated the outbreak of the French Revolution), this future needs a far more penetrating foresight, from a higher standpoint than earth and time can offer, and involves the disentangling of a skein much too subtle and complex for other than Omniscience to take up and unravel; "For (it is laid down as another axiom) prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and surely what needs Divine aid to lay down, needs Divine aid to take up. And only so, can it be taken up by such as we are.

Prophecy, therefore, must be looked upon as "a light shining in a dark place." And its fulfilment and disclosure are to be found only in the event and not in the mere forecast of it. In the event, I say, either as embodied in the historical unfolding of the actual final items that were foreshown, or in the actual events coming to pass at greater or lesser distances beforehand, that were interposed by way of introduction and for useful admonition, and needful self-defence when "the end of all things is at hand." And in itself and the manner of its exhibition, never was a subject so fitted as this "more sure word of prophecy" to exercise the highest faculties of the mind, and cultivate for a nobler future the rarest graces of the soul. The drama of "the kingdom of heaven" possesses an epic power, and marches onward with a dramatic splendour and grave majesty, compared with which the noblest achievements, nay even the undying gifts of uninspired genius are poor, and tame, and mere child's play. And how this is so, and why this is not to be otherwise, becomes plain and palpable when one reflects that the fall of cities, the fate of nations, the deeds of heroes, even the commotions of Olympus, are dreams of nothing—or deeds of nothing worth, with at best, but a few of them worth being made into scenes or scraps of scenes in this drama, which embraces all time, exhausts all renown, exhibits all situations, reconciles all discrepancies, tests all hearts, and as a *denouement* and a catastrophe of unapproachable sublimity and awe, consummates all joys and woes for ever. Yes: of a truth, to note no more, the composite image of Daniel, the seals of the Apocalypse of John the Divine—the trumpets—the thunders—the vials of wrath—the woman in forlorn plight, now in reach of the dragon, opening wide his pitiless jaws, now fled into the wilderness, and her babe caught up to God, and His throne—the harlot with her mystic name and allotted seat, and scarlet robe and cup of deadly sorceries; the three confederate powers of evil vanquished with infamous rout at the moment of vain-glorious triumph: Babylon

sunk as a stone in the mighty waters; the fair bride come forth arrayed in white, emblem meet of her beauty of holiness; the Lamb, in His radiant beamings of grace and majesty; the Paradise of God, with new Jerusalem superadded, emerging in emerald freshness and fashioned with costly splendour, to become (after this poor, small, sin-stained theatre of affairs has been purged with "flaming fire"), the home and the heritage of the "pure in heart" for ever. Yes, these, and all that may intervene as well, until these are accomplished and sped on to their destination, are made known to us in "the prophetic word" as "a light shining in a dark place until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts."

4. Passing over for a while the allusion of the text, we may well glance at our Lord's own revealings concerning His Second Advent as the very kernel of this subject. On nothing does He labour so strenuously, or give such earnest and varied instruction. He holds forth His Second Coming as a most certain event, and lays down His word about it, firm as the pillars of heaven and earth, yet He re asserts, just as strongly, another fact—that the exact time of this is unknown—unknown to men, to prophets, to apostles, to angels, to Himself as Mediator, and known only to His Father in Heaven. In several parables and by startling illustrations He sets forth the duty of Christians under such conditions to be, that they may read and mark the signs of the times, as men know of summer coming, or of storms gathering. And "not knowing" is branded as a high contempt, and as a wild act of reckless rebellion. But our Lord also explicitly, and in reply to a question put, gives very exact and sufficient directions for the safety of His disciples in the unequalled horrors at the destruction of Jerusalem. "The signs" He gives are most plain and patent. Jerusalem encompassed with armies, and the abomination of desolation standing in the Holy Place. When they see these things, let them flee to the mountains, leaving all behind, household goods, even clothes, and let them know that the desolations are nigh.

Again, concerning His final "presence," and the end of the world (of which the destruction of Jerusalem was but the prelude and foretaste), our Lord is not less emphatic and graciously communicative. And so, He tells explicitly that "this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end (be) come." All this, with such like other signs given, is enough in the dangers of the future, and for its duties too. And these duties are self-control, watching, and constant prayer. And Christians are to be known as those who love the appearing of their Lord, who look for Him the second time, who shall open immediately when He knocks, because they are ever hastening unto, nay, even hastening onward, the coming of

their Lord. But at the same time they are represented as exclaiming, and with exultation too, "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for Him, and He will save us." Theirs, too, is "the patient waiting for of Jesus Christ." Theirs it is, "whether in the first watch or in the fourth," to be always ready, for, "in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh."

5. And here a painful duty must not be shirked; let it not either be rudely discharged. Godless indifference and Godly foresight are not the only attitudes assumed by those who call themselves Christians. We allude to those who, like "the prophet that hath spoken presumptuously," indulge in speculative chronologies and prophetic charts, and tabulated programmes of "the times and seasons." All attempts to peer into the future are not lawful, nor expedient either, nor to be profitably undertaken. See how humble, sober, modest and saintly, as well as brave and wise, were the true prophets of old, from Moses to Malachi. And the Apostles followed them in this; like John, who was "in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard a voice behind him." And, see, again, what mistakes, what blunders, what blindness were exhibited concerning the very plainest statements about the future, though issuing even from the lips of the Lord Himself. The statements as to "the leaven," the treachery of Judas, the earthly *final* of John, are all misapprehended. Some put things past into the future, as the coming of Elias: some invert the presumption, and put things of the future among those that are fulfilled, as Hymenæus and Philetus in the matter of the resurrection. If the wicked servant said, "My lord delayeth his coming," and put far off the evil day of retribution, the Jews, with thoughtless levity (like their ancestors, whom Amos rebuked, saying, "Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord; to what end is it for you?") thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. Peter, not knowing what he said, cries out, "It is good for us to be here; let us make three tabernacles." The disciples again ask Jesus, "Wilt Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" And, as if to keep up a succession and maintain the tradition of presumptuous blunderings and unseemly impatience, what does one find for the last half century, and more? We have, in every form prophetic speculations poured forth, the authors of which all disagree in the starting-point, most in the principles of chronology (if even they do recognize any), while they all agree in prognosticating a result falsified by the event. But it is the effects; not "the folly" of such a practice that make it at all worth notice. The statistics of lunacy have a division for "religious madness," and those who have professionally visited the patients' wards, well know the silent and despairing ones, also the noisy declaimers about the advent

of "the King in His glory," whom they not seldom affect to personate. The pious and earnest in the whole Church of Christ are sorely perplexed, scandalised, and sometimes misled in this way. The sensual and godless confirm themselves in their evil courses from these prophetic forecasts that fail so egregiously. The contentious retort with but the logic of contradictoriness, proclaiming the absolute distance, as these do the immediate imminence of "the day of the Lord." But it is "the scoffers and mockers, walking after their own lusts," who reap the most abundant harvests from all this. As if the overflowings of their own evil hearts did not suffice, as befell in the days of Noah, Isaiah, Jesus, and Peter, these gather confidence from year after year passing by with the forecasted event not coming to pass, and they fill all companies, and furnish the comic press with scoffs and jeers and biting sarcasms on this awful subject, the certainty and the decisive character of which baffle all adequate human comprehension, while they invite implicit faith and reward dutiful observance.

6. Passing from this grievous exhibition, the notice of which is forced upon the Church by reason of "the folly of interpreters, which has brought prophecy into contempt," as has been said,* and thereby done a most serious damage to Christianity itself, which leans so much upon the future, as it leads so nobly into it—all this, however, is no good reason why piety and modesty may not use it freely, and apply its lessons with all the profit it brings. And all the rather so, as the more prophecy is subject to a general neglect or to a corrupt handling, the greater the need for its teachings, and the more weighty the Nemesis of its disregard.

And this brings us to the subject of "The Dawn and the Day-Star," which remind us of the lines of Leyden, an English poet, on the Star of Evening:—

"Or, hanging o'er the mirror-stream,
To mark that image trembling there,
Thou seem'st to smile with softer gleam,
To see thy lovely face so fair."

Or, can you picture a common incident in colonial life? The colonist prospecting locations to settle down upon, or mines to work, often camps beside some creek, or river, or sheet of water. In the chill morn, the fires burning low, he rises, and beholds with hope the first tinge of rosy light spreading the joy of dawn. Fearing this may be but the broad glare of forest fires raging among the hills and valleys far away, he looks again, and sees, for his comfort, "the day-star," now "flaming in the forehead of the morn;" sees, too, its ruddy glow reflected in the spread of splendour across the broad bosom of the waters before him—waters neither torn by the rage of tempests, nor befouled with the dull weed that

* By Sir Isaac Newton, on Daniel.

rots at ease, nor closed out of view by the envious outpouring of chill exhalations. And thus, yes thus, let it be for us, that when "the day dawns, and the day-star arises," that it shall "arise" both on and from "hearts" with passions quelled, with receptive powers quickened, with intercepting influences wiped away. Thus, also, let the refracted rays of the Sun of Righteousness shed a welcome light as He arises, and while every sign and portent confirm the waiting and watching Christian in his "joy unspeakable and full of glory." Well is it to read the signs of the times, and know no less than this, *when* the day of harvest is come. Well, nay better by far, to be ourselves of the golden grain "ripe unto harvest," that shall be bound in sheaves in the day of decision and upborne to God on angels' bosoms. Or, to put this matter in another light: it must never be forgotten by Christians that the limitation—"no prophecy of the Scripture is of private interpretation"—applies quite as strongly to the time of "the dawn and day-star," as it does to the time of the Church using "the light in a dark place." When the time arrives for Christians to understand sufficiently for their safety and encouragement, the intimations of prophecy read in the light of the signs of the times, and, above all, of "the time of the end," we may feel perfectly confident that what shall be finished God has foreshown, just as certainly and punctually as in the case of the deliverance from Egypt foretold to Abraham, of which we read, "and it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, *even the self-same day it came to pass*, that all the hosts of the Lord went up from the land of Egypt." And further, we may assure our trembling and trusting hearts, that just as clearly and kindly as our Lord answered the inquiries of John's messengers by referring them to "what ye see and hear" of prophecy having its full literal completion in stirring and striking facts, which none but the impious could deny, none but the reckless could disregard, even so shall it be yet once again. And this not without adequate intimations, and yet not without sufficient precautions against abuse, shall be found light and guidance and hope and joy by them that have "an ear to hear;" even then, while in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished, as He hath declared to His servants the prophets; and "the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever."

7. Thus "ye do well to take heed unto the word of prophecy," thus to look out for "the dawn and the day-star." And even if, as the Lord promised "to him that overcometh and keepeth His words to the end," that "He will give him the morning star," nay, adds at the close of the Apocalypse, "I am the bright and morning

star"—still, for all that, "the mystery of God shall be finished," none otherwise than "as He hath declared to His servants the prophets;" and "He also sends His angel to testify these things in the Churches." And where is there the slightest intimation in "the Scriptures" either that "the Star of Bethlehem" was a star at all, in the sense that Venus, now appearing in the heavens, is called "a star," or was rather a comet, as Kepler and other astronomers since have pronounced it most probably to have been; or that Venus, now in particular relations on her ordinary course, is this star, even supposing it such a thing; or that this star has anything the least to do with "the sign of the Son of man" to be seen in the heavens. Whereas, concerning this latter, Jesus, when adjured in Caiaphas' hall, who and what He was, answered nothing whatsoever about their seeing this star, or any star, but only spake of their seeing Himself—"Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."

This little talk and bustle about "the Star of Bethlehem" is but a feather, yet it shows how the wind blows. If people, forsaking the plain teachings of Scripture, "please themselves," in their ignorance of science alike as of Scripture, with fanciful portents and exciting surmises, that are only calculated to amuse and to alarm in the way of superstition, romance, and credulity, then they exhibit themselves ripe for becoming the prey of the religious impostor or the political desperado, like the Jews, led into rebellion by "Barchocab" or "the son of a star," in old Balaam's prophecy, which he applied to himself without warrant. As the back is made for the burden, and the blue-bottle fly for the blood-sucking spider, so fanatics become the prey of villains and fools the victims of rogues. Indeed it might be worth while, in view of this common weakness in the Church, to analyse the lists of the religious sects in England and Wales, and examine how far wild speculations and exciting assertions on the subject of the Second Advent form the main features and principal attractions of such extensive and growing exhibitions of schism and folly, if not of many other serious evils as well. Against all this Christianity solemnly protests, and history abounds with warnings in the humiliating narratives of "popular superstitions" and contagious frenzies. With these and so many other perils and trials, sore and varied, to be encountered, with what earnestness and attention, with what love and loyalty should Christians bear in mind the solemn warning, "He that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved." And accordingly, while using the light of prophecy "in the night, at the dawn, and when the day-star ascends," they must exercise the utmost caution against a fatal misuse of what are at once blessed helps or else awful tests exactly as taken by themselves.

THE TREASURE IN EARTHEN VESSELS.

BY THE LATE REV. EDWARD MEADE, RECTOR
OF WINKFIELD, WILTS, AND CANON OF SARUM.

SERMON FOR EMBER WEEK, PREACHED SEPTEMBER
12TH, 1886.

"We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."—2 Cor. iv. 7.

THE Ember season claims our prayers and intercessions for the Sacred Ministry—for those who are to be admitted to any holy office, and for the bishops, and chief pastors of Christ's flock, to whom it belongs to set apart fit persons to serve in the same. If we value the work of Christ, the spread of His kingdom, and the salvation of souls, the appeal for our earnest prayers will surely never be made in vain. And since the more we understand the nature of the ministry, the more we shall see its importance, and be moved to a lively interest in all that concerns it, I desire to engage your attention this morning upon the inquiry how we are scripturally to regard the ministry of the Church of Christ, how we should be disposed towards it, and what benefit we are justified in expecting from it.

First, then, by the ministry is meant a peculiar ordinance of the Lord's own appointment. And those who occupy that office faithfully are ambassadors of God, and represent Christ Himself; for so it was declared by His own voice, "As my Father sent me, even so send I you;" and again, "He that heareth you, heareth Me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me, and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me." And as these words were spoken not to the twelve Apostles only, but to other seventy who were sent out on a special occasion, we are bound to regard all who are rightly commissioned ministers as a peculiar ordinance of the Lord Himself, expressly designed as ambassadors in His kingdom, as stewards in His family, as servants of His people for Jesus' sake. "For we preach not ourselves," writes St. Paul, a little above, "but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." Just as the written word is a means of grace, "making wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus," and just as the holy sacraments are wells of saving power and grace to those who, by the aid of faith draw from them the water of life, so are those who minister a Divine ordinance for dispensing and applying both the word and the sacraments to the consciences and hearts of their fellow-sinners, and of "making ready a people prepared for the Lord" when He shall come. "These are they which show unto men the way of salvation." And if so, it is difficult to represent too forcibly the responsibility of those who bear the office, that they discharge it faithfully, for, "it

is required in stewards that they be found faithful;" and it is no less difficult to over-rate the solemn duty resting upon you, my brethren, to employ the ministry aright with due reverence, with teachableness, and with mixture of faith, that it may be in you a "savour of life unto life," and that the things designed for your peace be not made "an occasion of falling." Whether you consider the ministry you may always hear the humble cry, "Brethren, pray for us," or whether you consider your own position as hearers and disciples, you may well be moved to the earnest, watchful, and wrestling supplication that you may not "receive the grace of God in vain," that you may not trifle away by proud and wilful judging of the Word the blessing you might have won, if you had sought it in a reverent, and teachable spirit, and that you may not, through worldly "hardness of heart and contempt of the Word," smother the doctrine, and profane the ordinance of God, so that, while it bear fruit on the good ground, it should in yourselves be only a heaping up of fuel for the everlasting burnings.

Now look at the words of St. Paul in the text, and you will observe how he speaks of the ministry in two ways: 1. As to the substance of it:—"this treasure." 2. As to the containing instrument:—"an earthen vessel." "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels."

First, then, that which the ministry is ordained to dispense and apply is not a common matter, but a "treasure" (a secret, for it is again and again represented as hidden), which whosoever obtains is made truly rich. There is in this matter no privilege of birth, or of class, or of worldly goods. To the possession of this treasure, "not many wise, not many noble are called," but where it is possessed, however great may be the want of all other things, there is abundance. He who has this treasure is complete, for he is "filled out of all the fulness of God," and, though in poverty, and distress, he realises the Apostle's paradox, "as having nothing, yet possessing all things." Where this treasure is, there are all things, for "all things are yours, whether life or death, things present or things to come, all things are yours," because "ye are Christ's and Christ is God's." The treasure with which the sacred ministry has to deal, which they who minister have to dispense and to recommend, and, even with much entreaty as well as warning, to press upon the acceptance of those to whom they are sent, is "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." This is the way in which the Apostle very briefly expresses it in words just before the text itself. It is the wonderful counsel of God, whereby, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, sin is pardoned, iniquity covered, and transgressions not imputed, and the kingdom of Heaven with all its glorious beauty thrown open to all believers. This treasure signified by our blessed Lord as the "one

thing needful," and the "pearl of great price" is by the Apostle represented as the "manifold wisdom of God," and "the unsearchable riches of Christ." There is no one that accepts that eternal life, the purchase of Christ's blood for the sinner, which is also the free gift of God, who, with true penitent heart and living faith embraces and holds it fast—there is no one who is thus blessed of God who can ever want. The richest man may become a very poor man, for "riches make to themselves wings, and fly away," and worldly prosperity has before now ended in the poor-house; but, whatever may be the worldly circumstances of him who embraces the treasure, wrapped up in Christ, contained in the Word and dispensed by the ministry, has in himself the fountain of sufficiency, and will never know those bitterest of bitter things, the horror of spiritual famine, and the tremendous wreck of spiritual bankruptcy. Such then, my brethren, is the substance of the ministry. "Who is wise, and he will understand these things." Who is foolish but the man who covets the mammon of the world, and despises the true riches, who if he can but "lade himself with the thick clay" of earthly good things is indifferent about the "pearl of great price," and about the "good part which can never be taken away."

Here then is the treasure, but how is it contained? Here is the treasure, but what is the treasury? It was anciently the custom with heathen states to deposit their chief and most precious effects in the marble halls of their most distinguished temples. The place which contained the treasure bore some proportion in dignity to the treasure itself. It is not so with the great and unsearchable riches of Christ. This noble deposit, whose nature is divine, whose preciousness is beyond all merchandise of silver, and even of fine gold, which is more precious than rubies, so that "all the things that thou canst desire are not to be compared unto it," is committed in the mysterious counsel of God to "earthen vessels." "We" says the Apostle, "have this treasure in earthen vessels." We who are called to dispense the treasures of Christ, "bringing forth things new and old," we who are called as stewards to rule and to feed the household of faith, we, whose work it is to allure by the most gracious invitations, and to awaken by the most awful denunciations, to assure to the trembling penitent the free forgiveness of all his sins, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, and to fix the seal of condemnation on the hardened sinner, "have this treasure in earthen vessels." It has been committed in the wise, but mysterious dispensation of God Himself, not to the "Principalities and powers in heavenly places," not to angels or archangels, who are glorious in holiness, and who are excellent in power, but to poor, weak and sinful men, that "dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust" (Job iv. 19). Subject to the same temptations, burdened

by the same guilt, compassed by the same infirmities, needing the same mercy, debtors to the same free grace, the ministers of Christ are, as St. Paul, "in weakness, and in fear and in much trembling," confident, nevertheless, in the power of the great Master, and emboldened by His authority and commission to "reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering, and doctrine."

It is not difficult to see what follows from all this. To those who exercise the ministry, the admonition is most weighty, to be diligent, to be faithful, and to take heed lest, having preached to others we ourselves should not be found worthy. To you, my brethren, the exhortation is equally clear, that you do not undervalue the ordinance, because of the frailty, the sad failures, the lamentable inconsistencies of those who are appointed to minister it. If you despise those who minister, you are judging and reproaching God Himself, because He has chosen to commit the treasure to "earthen vessels." Rather give glory to Him who can and does work the wonders of His grace by instruments, to our view so incompetent and unworthy, and be careful not to despise those whom the Lord has chosen to honour. It is your part also, to show a tender and prayerful concern that the ministry may be more worthy, through grace, of the treasure committed to it, and that it may be to yourselves "a savour of life unto life." To this end you will remember that it is the same with the ministry as with the Word, and the sacraments, it is an ordinance of faith. And if you are to receive a blessing, and not rather endanger your own souls, in your connection with the ministry, you must look through and above the weak instruments, the earthen vessels, fully persuaded, and acting on that persuasion, that the power is "of God, and not of us."

Finally, take heed of neglecting; take heed of despising the sacred ministry. It is a perilous amusement to make a jest, or an occasion of light discourse out of a divine ordinance. Reflect that it is for your own benefit, your growth in grace, and your salvation, that the Lord appointed and has continued the sacred ministry, and, if you receive it as of the Lord, then it will become His gracious gift to you. For "all things are for your sakes," that the abundant grace might, through the thanksgiving of many, redound to the glory of God."

ON New Year's Day a Mission Church was opened by Archdeacon Sir Lovelace Stamer in the Talke Pits district of the parish of Talke. The building, which is to accommodate 240, has been designed by Mr. Beardmore. The foundation-stone was laid in the summer of last year by Mrs. Edwards Heathcote, wife of the member for North-west Staffordshire. This building was much needed, and stands in the centre of a district containing about 1,500 people.



NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 6d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1888.

GLEBE LANDS.

AT the time of the General Election of 1885 a great deal was made about "three acres and a cow," and this was held out as a bribe to the agricultural labourers, in order to secure their votes for the Liberal candidates; that has all passed away, and now we scarcely ever hear the subject mentioned. All that has been done, has been to bring the subject of allotments before people, and many land-owners have shown their sympathy with the labouring classes, by offering to them at a reasonable rent, plots of ground, on which to grow vegetables, etc., but that the "three acres and a cow" would ever take with the multitude was a dream which hardly any sensible man could ever expect to come to pass. It was only one of those party catchwords used for the purpose of setting the masses against the classes.

It would be well in many places if more allotments could be provided, but local circumstances must in all cases be taken into account; the allotment land must be close to the cottage of the labourer, so that he can easily go to it when his day's work is done and do "a turn" at gardening; but if the land is at some little distance, then it will be useless as allotment land, for the labourer does not, as a rule, care to walk a distance after his day's work is done; this extra exertion takes away all the pleasure of the bit of land.

With regard to Glebe Lands, we find that Viscount Cross is anxious to facilitate the sale of these lands, in order on the one side to relieve the clergy from the burden of land, and on the other to facilitate the use of this land for allotment purposes. We quite believe that his Lordship proposes this measure with the very best of intentions, and with the hope of conferring a benefit to the Church;

but we think that anything in the shape of "panic legislation," either with regard to this matter or any other, is to be deprecated. That we have fallen on evil times goes without saying, and that many clergy whose income is derived mainly from land, have suffered, and are at the present time suffering great privations. This has clearly been demonstrated by the letters of Mr. Protheroe, in the *Guardian*, and the series of letters on "The Church and the Land," in the *Morning Post* a short time ago; but we think that it would be a great mistake for the clergy to sell all their lands at the present time, when land hardly fetches any price at all. And while we can well understand the feeling that urges the necessity of meeting the question of the day by a fair distribution of allotments, yet this is not the panacea for all the ills of agricultural depression, for no sooner is one supposed evil rectified, than we shall see that political wire-pullers and agitators will soon find some other weapon wherewith to fight the clergy, yet it must be borne in mind that *all* glebe land is not suitable for allotments, or to be placed in the hands of smaller holders. Arable land may be useful to the small holder, because on one portion he may grow potatoes, and on another vegetables, and on another oats, &c., but what about the broad acres of rich pasture land which belong to many clergy? These require cattle, and to stock them well requires a certain amount of capital; whence are the advocates of small holdings of the now proverbial "three acres and a cow" going to provide this, in order to give the labourers a going concern? for without this the land would be a veritable "white elephant" to many men. Times are bad we all know, and bitter trouble is occasioned to many a country parson, and therefore, in the hope of being freed from the burden and the trouble of farming his glebe, he would be willing to sacrifice anything in order to be free from it. It would be far better to devise some tentative scheme, in order to ease the burdens, than that the lands should be sold for a mere song. The old proverb is undoubtedly true, that "the longest lane has a turning," and, from the mutterings that are to be heard, it may be that we are on the verge of a "fiscal reform," and possibly the promised Local Government Bill will remove some of the burdens at present laid upon the land. At any rate, it is to be hoped that something will be done, and that speedily, to remove the agricultural depression, otherwise we shall see agriculture, as a factor in the nation's trade, a thing of the past, and the land falling out of cultivation entirely.

Another objection to the sale of the glebe lands at a low price is that, if this is allowed, the purchase money would have to be invested in consols or some other personal security. And, supposing for a moment that disestablishment and disendowment were to take place, the whole of the incomes of the clergy thus invested might be handed over, by a single

stroke of the pen, to some other fund, and devoted to some purpose other than that for which the endowment was left. And, moreover, to sell the landed property of the Church at the present time is, to a certain extent, to cut us adrift from the ancient past, of which we have long been used to boast, for the terriers of these lands show the ancient continuity of the Church and our link with the distant past, and in this way indirectly to facilitate the policy of confiscation. It may be said that we have no right to deal in sentiment, when the every-day present reality is forced upon us, viz., the distress of the clergy; on the other hand, we are firmly convinced that the present is *not* the time for selling the glebe lands of the Church; rather let the laity of the Church boldly put their shoulder to the wheel, and help the clergy in a time of distress; there is provided for them a Church and a clergyman, for which they have nothing to pay; is there not the need, then, for them to rise to a sense of their responsibilities and ease the burdens which fall on those ill-fitted to bear them?

IRISH CHURCH PROSPECTS IN 1888.—II.

(Communicated.)

IN a former article we gave one aspect of this position. For memory's sake we will recapitulate. Every farmhouse and cabin of Irish Protestants is now to be flooded with a penny weekly Church paper. Hitherto its price of 3d. kept it beyond the reach of the poor. Now, it is presumed by help of English Ritualists, it offers itself for one penny. It pretends, and its claim has not been denied, to be patronised by all the Irish Bishops but two. One Bishop, indeed, it says, speaks of its tone as "moderate." What that "moderate tone" is, we showed in our former article. The paper advocates adoration of a local corporal Presence. We use the terms advisedly. There is no other Presence conceivable, except a spiritual Presence, or one of grace and spirit and influence, which this paper spurns, under the epithet of "virtualistic." We showed that this paper, in letters admitted as agreeable with Church formularies, states that adoration of a local Presence is "virtually enjoined" by the Black Rubric, which nevertheless it despises, as of no authority whatsoever. So much for ground gone over in our former article.

2. Now we turn to the seed-bed and nursery of the Church—Trinity College and its Divinity School. Some time this year a Guild was set up in Trinity College, Dublin, for the enforcement of clerical celibacy and habitual private confession. This was reported to the Irish weekly paper. The answer was that there was not a word of truth in the story; and that, if any one believed it, he ought to resort to the diocesan and divinity authorities. That Guild flourishes still. But the

paper has never acknowledged that there is any truth in the matter. The diocesan and divinity authorities have given no sign of cognisance or disapprobation. Further, there is a Theological Society in Trinity College, Dublin, at the meetings of which the divinity professor presides. At a late meeting, an essay was read which, as reported by a clergyman present, taught transubstantiation, or Lutheran doctrines. The professors present made no sign. The author was appealed to, through the press, to print his essay, that all might judge of it. The appeal was made in vain. He has lately been distinguished by a prize, delivered by the divinity professor. So far he and his essay must be regarded by his fellow students as having the professorial sanction for his doctrines.

3. Now we turn in another direction. The incumbent of Grange Gorman dying, his body lay in state in the church; tapers burning night and day; the Holy Eucharist for repose offered daily. One of the assistant clergy at these rites, plainly contrary to our canons, was elected to the vacant church. The nominators, parochial and diocesan, and the diocesan himself here seem to give their sanction to these Ritualistic performances. The weekly paper speaks of the new appointment as a move in the right direction.

4. When the General Synod met in the summer, an attempt was made to bring the teaching of this paper before it. But technical difficulties were made, on the ground that the paper was no authorised organ of the Church. But this can scarcely be said now, as the Bishop of Derry, in his late charge, speaks of it as "an organ of our Church of moderate tone."

5. It is to be hoped that, when the General Synod meets next, in the summer, this paper will not hide itself behind technical forms, but bring boldly before the Synod what it has plainly stated in its pages. Then, when some can be got to avow them, we shall learn what the General Synod thinks of a corporal Presence in ninety places at once, what it thinks of adoration thereof, what authority it allows to the Black Rubric, what it thinks of the pretence that this Rubric virtually enjoins adoration of our Lord's Body, under the species, or appearances, of bread and wine. Let there, then, be no skulking. Let the Ritualistic clergy tell the Synod what they believe, and what not. Let them act as Bonner and Gardiner did against Cranmer and Ridley. Then we shall hear the Synod's voice with no uncertain sound. Then we shall know whether the Irish Church follows the steps of Bramhall and Jeremy Taylor, or whether it has taken as its guide Newman and Manning, Croke, Walsh, and Nulty. It is too late now to take advantage of informalities. Who is on the Lord's side? "He that is not with me is against me." Our weekly paper must not hide merely under the shield of the *Church Times*. It must avow itself in harmony with the *Tablet*, the

Month, and the *Dublin Review*; either that, or humbly repent, and retract, and assume to itself the part of a Protestant, though strictly Catholic, organ of the Irish branch of Christ's Church.

THE University of Durham did a wise thing in making their B.D. degree accessible to the younger clergy, and we are glad to see that it is still further encouraging theological studies by two new additions to the regulations for this degree; one admits a new set of candidates, the other increases the choice of subjects by adding a very useful and attractive one. 1. Any Bachelor of Arts or Master of Arts of Oxford, Cambridge, or Dublin, who has taken *ad eundem* at Durham and is of at least four years' standing from such *ad eundem* degree. 2. Church History.—The Ecclesiastical History of the British Isles to the death of Bede. Text Books, Haddan and Stubbs "Councils and Eccles. Documents," vol. i., pp. 1-198; Bede's "Eccl. Hist." iii. and iv. (Ed. Mayor and Lumby, Camb. Press); Adamnan's "Life of S. Columba" (Ed. Reeves). Or, Philosophy.—English thought in the 18th century, with special attention to Berkeley and Butler.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCHES.

A PAPER READ AT A CLERICAL MEETING BY THE REV. BROWNLOW MAITLAND, Nov., 1887.

(Continued from page 22.)

From Hooker I turn to another master of our Anglican theology, Barrow, and find him taking the same line, with even greater definiteness and precision. After defining to the same effect the visible Catholic Church, within which he observes that particular churches are co-ordinate, he defines the Church in the highest sense, *i.e.*, the Church mystical, the Body of Christ, as "the whole body of God's people that is, ever hath been, or ever shall be, from the beginning of the world to the consummation thereof, all true believers and faithful servants of Christ in all ages and places, past, present, and yet to come, in earth, in heaven, or yet unborn, inscribed in the divine registry."

Here we have what may be called the Anglican tradition respecting the uses of the term Church, when taken absolutely; that in a lower sense, as describing something visible on earth, it is a name which groups together all the living persons at any time in the world who are Christians by profession; while, in a higher sense, it denotes an invisible, mystical communion, composed of all true saints of God who have ever lived, or are still living, and to which all true saints yet to be born shall in their time be added.

For myself, I do not perceive any feasible way of escape from the necessity of following this tradition; so far, at least, as it employs two definitions to distinguish between that visible body with which, as living churchmen, we are in certain relations, and that mystical body, into the spiritual communion of which we are called as believers in Christ. There certainly is a portion of mankind always existing in the world which is marked off from the rest by profession of faith in Christ; it is in perpetual flux, wasted on one

side by deaths, recruited on the other by baptisms; if not organised as a whole, like the separate or particular churches of which it is the aggregate, it is equally definite and discernible, and it is entitled to be called the visible Church just as truly as they are to be called visible Churches. But it does not and cannot comprise the faithful dead any more than they do, for it is but the sum total of them. The faithful dead must belong to a quite different category. Yet we must have a definition of the Church which includes them, for by their very nature they are members of that body of Christ, which is styled in Scripture the Church. We are thus driven by facts to accept a second definition; and of this it seems that "invisible" must be a part, just as "visible" was of the other. For of the three classes which the Anglican tradition ascribes to it, the departed and the unborn are invisible, and so also in respect of their membership are the living.

Against this conclusion, however, it is argued, in favour of a single definition, that whether we speak of the body or congregation to which all living Christians belong by virtue of their baptism, or of the body to which the faithful dead belong, we are speaking of the same identical body, of which the two parts, one visible, the other invisible, together make up an organic whole. If so, our usual language will need to be altered. It would be no longer correct to speak of the Church invisible, because the one and only Church would be visible in part; but it would be equally incorrect to speak of the Church visible, because what is visible would not be the whole Church, but only a part of it. That, perhaps, might not much matter. But there is a more serious consequence to be considered. In a living organic body, such as Christ's mystical body is, all the members, whatever their individual functions, bear the same vital relation to the Head, otherwise they would not be real members. If, then, every professing Christian, however unworthy and faithless, is by virtue of his baptism just as really a member of Christ's mystical body as are His departed saints; his union with Christ must be as real and vital as theirs. Is it possible for us to maintain that dogmatically? Allowing all the privileges which baptism conveys, as admitting the baptised into the congregation of Christ's flock, sealing to them the divine promises, and making them free of all the Church's ministries and means of grace, can we go on to assert that, irrespective of any repentance or faith on the recipient's part, it does *ipso facto* put him and maintain him in the same vital union with Christ which His ingathered saints enjoy? If unworthy recipients of the Eucharist "in no wise are partakers of Christ," how can we affirm that unworthy professors do infallibly so partake of Christ by virtue of their baptism, that they are vitally united to Him in the fellowship of His mystical body? Yet within the visible Church such professors are innumerable, and are beyond man's judgment. Again, whereas it rests with the pastors of the visible Church to admit members into it or to expel members from it, is it possible to hold dogmatically that such admissions or expulsions, however erroneous they may be, are absolutely admissions into, or expulsions from that mystical body of Christ, of which every member is vitally united to Him in the life of the Spirit? To my mind, a definition of the Church which places all the insincere and evil professors of Christianity belonging to the visible Church on the same footing as the sainted dead, and lumps all, both those and these, together in that

spiritual organism which is growing into the everlasting body of the incarnate Son of God, appears to be self-condemned. It classes in one category things which are essentially different; confounds ecclesiastical membership and status with spiritual vitality and the possession of eternal life; and undertakes to construct a living organism out of disparate elements which are incapable of organic union.

I do not for a moment deny that the visible Church on earth, as a divinely constituted society, is the image and presentment to mankind of the mystical body of Christ, in the same way that any imperfect and earthly type may be the visible image and presentment of a heavenly anti-type; and that, by reason of this relation, it may appropriate to itself in a qualified sense, by way of accommodation and charitable presumption, those lofty delineations of sacredness and divine benediction which, in the fulness of their meaning, can only be dogmatically affirmed of the Church mystical and invisible. But this is a very different thing from so amalgamating the visible and invisible under a single definition as to make those delineations, taken in the same sense, their common property. I feel compelled to side with Hooker when he writes of the Church mystical and invisible as follows:—"Whatsoever we read in Scripture concerning the endless love and the saving mercy which God sheweth towards His Church, the only proper subject thereof is this Church." And again, "As those everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness belong to the mystical Church, even so, on the other side, when we read of any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company. And this visible Church in like manner is but one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last end." Nor can I refrain from echoing his remark when he adds, "For lack of diligently observing the difference, first between the Church of God mystical and visible, then between the visible sound and corrupted, sometimes more, sometimes less, the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed."

But, while I urge that, logically and doctrinally, two definitions are necessary to avoid confusion between the Church militant here in earth on one side, with its various institutions, duties, claims, and privileges, and the mystical body of Christ on the other side, with its glorious attributes and magnificent destiny: I do not feel quite satisfied that the description of the latter, as given by Hooker and Barrow, answers in every respect to St. Paul's conception as expressed in the passages to which I have referred. He seems to idealise the Church from a somewhat different point of view. Perhaps it is hard to express what I mean, except vaguely, but it is something of this sort. He sees mankind to have been created in Christ and for Christ, for the purpose of becoming, in the fulness of time, an organic body with which the Eternal Son should clothe Himself; a living and inseparable part of Himself, so moulded round Him and vitally one with Him, that in and through it He should henceforth manifest His presence and exert His divine energies in the universe. To bring about this ultimate destiny of mankind is, in the Apostle's thought, the whole design and end of redemption. Redemption is the development of mankind into the body of Christ. The process is initiated in the incarnation, made effective through the passion and exaltation, carried on, step by step, by means of the divine society, the fellowship of believers established in the world. The final result—

this mysterious and mystical body, into which, through his faith in God's eternal purpose, St. Paul beholds man being gradually formed—is to him in its highest sense the Church. It is God's ideal, towards which events are evermore moving onwards; an ideal more or less typified or imaged forth in every Christian community and every individual believer; advanced towards realisation by the safe in-gathering of every dying saint; and certain, as God's ideals must be, to become actual in God's own time. Such appears to me to be St. Paul's conception; and I take it to be larger and more ideal than that which Hooker and Barrow express, when they define the Church mystical as the aggregate of all true believers, past, present, and to come.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

PARTIES IN THE REVISION SYNOD.

SIR,—I proposed that your correspondent, "Even-Handed Justice," should produce some member of the Irish Synod to endorse his statements. He tells your readers plainly enough, in reply, that he cannot find such a witness. He says that it is useless to call on any of the High Party to speak out. Now I am a High Churchman, and I propose to speak out.

I voted, in the Synod, against every tampering with the baptismal services, and against every tampering with the hymn *Qui cunque vult*. I was much struck, when the discussion on this latter came on, with the following, which may be new to your correspondent. The determination to alter that hymn, or, if that could not be done, to expel it from our services, was much stronger on the part of the Low Churchmen than on the part of the Broad Churchmen. The latter were few in number, and it could only be by chance that they could turn a division. On the whole, with the exception of two knots of members, neither of them large, there was no systematic or party voting. There was such an amount of what would be called in Parliament cross-voting, that any analysis of votes would be almost certain to lead to wrong inferences. In fact, a coalition or alliance between parties was an impossibility.

I deny, from what is equivalent to positive personal knowledge, that there was any alliance or contract whatever between any sets of persons, Low, Broad, or otherwise, to make changes in our Prayer-book. My own evidence being of course not conclusive, I call as evidence your correspondent himself. He says in one letter that there was such an alliance; in another letter he says that he did not mean to say that there was any alliance. He says in his letter in yesterday's PULPIT, "that men so voted is plain. Why they did so they know best, and I do not pretend to say." In his letter in the PULPIT of 12th November, he says that the Low Party voted to please the Broad, and the Broad voted to please the Low. A witness who breaks down and contradicts himself in this style is the best possible witness for the other side.

In the matter and manner of "Even-Handed Justice's" letters, I think I discern a likeness to another of your customary correspondents, who has several times complained that the *Church Times* and

the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* will not print his contributions. Your "communicated" article in yesterday's PULPIT, attacking the last of those periodicals, appears to be from the same hand. The action of the editors of them is attributed to *odium theologicum*. If there be any difficulty in the matter, it appears to me that it is far more surprising that you, Sir, admit his letters than that other papers do not. If the Rev. Mr. Crosthwaite cannot obtain a hearing through the press, perhaps he might try to get into the Synod of this diocese, if indeed any of his brother clergy would vote for him.

B.

Dublin, 15th January, 1888.

THE IRISH AND THE WELSH CHURCH.

Mutato nomine, de te
Fabula narratur.—HORACE.

SIR,—It is astounding how shamelessly all the arguments, which we in vain produced, in order to stay execution, in the case of the Irish Church, are paraded in favour of the Welsh, now lying under sentence.

This has been shown in your pages before; but a letter in this week's *Church Times* is so put to the point, that I cannot refrain from noticing it, and comparing the cases of the two churches. I will only make one remark as prefatory. The Ritualistic party, both in England, and also, alas, here in Ireland, so despised our Church as Protestant, that they consented to her plunder and degradation. It would never help Ritualism, then "down with it even to the ground!" Now, after begging it and, as far as they and the G. O. M. could, destroying it, they have found out that it might have done their work, and that if pruned and manured, it need not have been cut down. Alas! they have found this out too late to prevent its plunder and its being put on a level with all the sects. What they find they can do to Romanise us, they are now trying, by means of our only weekly paper. But of *this* your readers have heard already, so I will return to my text, "*de te fabula narratur*."

2. I will quote from this letter, only putting Irish for Welsh, when necessary. "The only marvel is that the Welsh (Irish) Church has any existence at the present day in the Principality (in the sister island), for we have never read of any branch of the Episcopal Church that has been more trodden down under foot than this Church. It is a powerful argument for its divine origin that she is existing and flourishing at the present day. It is much more ancient than the English Church, and I hope to be able to show this shortly. Although trodden down by man for 1800 (700) years, it still exists as the true Catholic branch of the Church Universal in this part of the country. It is no 'alien church,' as its enemies would have it to be, but the old Episcopal Church of the Cymry (Irish), with its bishops, priests, and deacons. It held fast to their orders before its union with the Anglican branch, or perhaps I should say before the union of the Anglican branch with the ancient British (Irish) Church. Before St. Augustine (Henry II.) ever arrived from the Bishop of Rome in England (Ireland), there was (for 700 years), a strong, flourishing British (Irish) Church, with its own bishops, priests and deacons, and ecclesiastically and in some points of doctrine, independent of Rome.

Before the arrival of Augustine the Monk in the year 596 (Henry II. in 1172), there was an ancient Church here." Here we cease the letter for a while. As to Ireland, we can prove the fact that Henry II. and his Papal backers set up the clergy of the Pale in opposition to the original Irish clergy of the other parts of Ireland, treating them as if they were scarcely deserving of the name of Christians, dividing us, in fact, into two opposition Irish Churches. (See Philan's remains.) To return to the letter: "We cannot forbear observing that this monk Augustine (Henry II., Giraldus Cambrensis, etc.), was too overbearing towards the Church of Cymry (Ireland). He found their liturgies, customs and observances somewhat differing from his own, but still he found here the Church in its integrity amongst the Cymry (the Irish). This is the Church that the radicals and extreme and bigoted sectarians of Wales (the radicals and ritualists of England and the papists of Ireland) would wish to upset (have, as far as Satan and man could, succeeded in upsetting)."

3. I might go on with this comparison, how England forced bishops upon us, counted unworthy of her own sees; how she refused us the Irish language; how she encouraged papists against us, bitter, because we tried to convert the Romanists, whom the G. O. M. lyingly told the ignorant Commons we neglected. All this I might go over. But what avail? A fool, or a madman, or an enthusiast, may do a mischief in a day which wise men cannot undo for ever after. All I have to say more is, that I wonder how the *Church Times* and its backers up will be able to show that all that this writer, Dr. James, truly avers, in favour of the Welsh Church, is to avail in its favour, when the very same arguments, used by us in favour of the Irish, were trampled on and ridiculed by the very same ritualistic paper and party that now parades them as unanswerable, in behalf of the Welsh Church. I will say no more, except to repeat with old Horace: *Mutato nomine, de te fabula narratur*.

4. So far I have treated the two cases as if they were similar. But, as Paddy would say, "there is a big differ." The Welsh Church had the whole population for 200 years, that is for six generations, they could speak the Welsh language and use it in church. Had they lost their flocks, they must answer for themselves. We never had the people's ear, because we were not allowed to use the Irish language in service; and none were ordained or promoted who could speak it. These were stale reasons no doubt. But such was the fact. For ten years the Pope allowed the people to attend our reformed service. No doubt he thought Elizabeth would give place to Mary of Scots. At any rate, without the Irish language his power could not be shaken. When he saw that Elizabeth was as good a man as her father, fearing neither the pope, the don, nor the devil, he ordered the people away from Church. So, as we never had the power of speaking to them in their own language, we never had them, and, unlike the Welsh Church, never lost them. Thus the cases were utterly dissimilar.

C. C., V.-G.

THE West Stranton Estate Company has just given a piece of land at West Hartlepool for a new church, towards which the Bishop of Durham has offered £1,000.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW." January, 1888. London: Nisbet & Co.

THE number contains ten articles, the best of which are Dr. Milligan's on the Unity of the Apocalypse; Dr. Jerdan's on Preaching; and Professor Radford Thomson's on the Relation of Evolution to Mind and Morals. The first of these would be more valuable were it not devoted to the needless task of refuting the latest German theory, to wit, that the Apocalypse is of composite origin; partly Jewish, partly Christian. Such a theory as this would have died of its own absurdity without Dr. Milligan's help; it would indeed hardly have lived the usual life of a German theory, which is until the appearance of the next.

We thoroughly endorse this opinion, which we extract from Dr. Jerdan's paper. "It is not the fearful or timid minister whom men respect. They know well that timidity in the pulpit is as fatal to success as timidity on the part of an operator in the surgery. Only the courageous, outspoken preacher who speaks the truth in love will be a leader of men."

Professor Radford Thomson's article hardly lends itself to quotation, and probably many readers will turn from it. Metaphysics are not popular reading, nor are they ever likely to become so. They are enchanted ground, protected by a very thorny hedge, but the hedge protects a garden of delight to those who do not mind a few thorns.

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that £70 7s. has been already contributed for a white frontal for the new altar in Lincoln Minster. The subscribers number 130. The fund for the altar linen and the green frontal has reached £26 14s. 7d. Only about half the money required for the execution of the entire design has been raised. The gifts have varied from £10 to 1s.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. Solomon Wall Sly, Vicar of Cratfield, Suffolk.
Andrews, Rev. Samuel Wright, M.A., Vicar of Usselby, Lincolnshire.
Angel-Smith, Rev. Francis Angel, M.A., LL.D., Rector of Batheaton, Somersetshire.
Athill, Rev. William R., to the Charge of Fyfield, Ongar.
Bailey, Rev. George, B.D., Rector of Addlethorpe, Lincolnshire.
Beachcroft, Rev. Charles Seward, M.A., Vicar of Arretton, Isle of Wight.
Beck, Rev. Harry Edward, M.A., Rector of Harpley; and Vicar of Houghton-next-Harpley, Norfolk.
Benthall, Rev. Octavius Arthur, M.A., Curate of Wilton; Rector of Osborne, Dorset.
Burnham, Rev. Frank, B.A., Vicar of Moor Allerton, Yorkshire.
Chatto, Rev. James Thomas Chipperfield, M.A., Vicar of St. Cuthbert with Holy Trinity, Thetford, Norfolk and Suffolk.
Craig, Rev. Stuart J., Rector of Lamplugh, Cumberland.
Deane, Rev. William Hodgson, M.A., Curate of the Parish Church, Peterborough; Vicar of St Mary's, Far Cotton, Northampton.
Druitt, Rev. Charles, M.A., Missioner of the Society of St. Andrew; Vicar of East and West Harnham.
Espin, Rev. T. E., D.D., Rector of Wolsingham and Chancellor of the Dioceses of Chester and Liverpool; Rural Dean of Stanhope.

Fisher, Rev. Frank Hugh, M.A., Curate of Ringmer, Sussex; Vicar of Cranborne-with-Boveridge, Salisbury.
Fry, Rev. Henry Lawrence, M.A., Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society (Canterbury Diocese); Vicar of Bexley-heath, Kent.
Gibson, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of St. Hilda's, Leeds.
Gillett, Rev. John William, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Dundry, Bristol.
Graves, Rev. John, M.A., Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty at Kensington Palace.
Johnson, Rev. William John, M.A., Licensed to Preach in the Diocese of Ripon.
Jones, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Rector of Llanegan, South Carnarvonshire; Honorary Canon of Bangor Cathedral.
Llewellyn, Rev. John, B.A., Curate; Rector of Willingham and Sotterley, Suffolk.
Mackintosh, Rev. W. Teesdale, B.A., M.A., Vicar of Thirsk.
Maitland, Rev. Thomas Archibald Fuller, M.A., Vicar of Bilton, Yorkshire.
Manley, Rev. Francis Hardwick, M.A., Vicar of Broad Somerford, Wilts.
Martyn, Rev. H. J., Curate-in-Charge of St. Nicholas's, Deptford; Vicar of Wealdstone.
Morton, Rev. Henry James, M.A., Rector of St. Sampson's, Cricklade, Wilts.
Munday, Rev. J. G., B.A., Curate of St. Michael's, Louth; Vicar of Bardney, near Lincoln.
Myers, Rev. Charles, M.A., Principal of St. Stephen's House, Oxford; Vicar of Lyme Regis, Dorset.
Newport, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rector of Wormshill, Kent; Rector of Tarrant Hinton, Dorset.
Pearce, Rev. Percy Frederick John, Vicar of Pulloxhill, Bedfordshire.
Preston, Rev. George Henry More, B.A., Vicar of Herriard, Hants.
Prole, Rev. Austin Buchanan, Vicar of Aldbrough, Yorkshire.
Ranger, Rev. Apsley Chase, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Huddersfield.
Rees, Rev. John, Vicar of Helpringham, Lincolnshire.
Scott, Rev. Edward Battyll, late Curate of Wood-green; Curate-in-Charge of St. Peter's Mission, Page-green, Tottenham.
Sellar, Rev. John A., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Windermere; Chaplain Madras Ecclesiastical Establishment.
Simpson, Rev. Reginald John, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Roundhay, Leeds.
Sims, Rev. A., B.A., Chaplain Royal Navy.
Stubbs, Rev. Charles W., M.A., Vicar of Stokenham, Kingsbridge, South Devon; Rector of Wavertree, Liverpool.
Thomas, Rev. John W., M.A., Curate of Meifod; Vicar of Bwlchyciban, Montgomery.
Tottenham, Rev. Edward B.A., Vicar of St. Ives, Hunts.
Trusted, Rev. W., Curate-in-Charge of St. John's, Heywood, Manchester.
Vernon, Rev. F. W., Vicar of Rangeworthy, Gloucestershire.
Wilkinson, Rev. Dr., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Plymouth; Archdeacon of Totnes.
Williams, Rev. Richard Mainwaring, M.A., Rector of Harnhill, and Vicar of Driffild, Gloucestershire.
Wood, Rev. William, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Moor Allerton, Leeds; to the Sole Charge of the Conventional District of Shore, Littleborough, Manchester.
Young, Rev. James, [M.A.] Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Deeping Fen, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Champernowne, Rev. Richard Keble, eldest son of the Rev. R. Champernowne, Vicar of Dartington, Totnes, at Thlotse, Basutoland, S. Africa, on the 14th ult.
Copestake, Rev. John Goodall, M.A., Rector of Trusley, at Trusley Rectory, on the 14th inst., aged 52.
Jones, Rev. J. D., Vicar of Colwyn, and J.P. for the county of Carnarvon, at Colwyn Vicarage, North Wales, on the 9th inst., aged 56.
Kaye, Rev. John, M.A., B.N.C., Oxon, at Norton, near Evesham, on the 9th inst., aged 81.
Ryan, Rev. Vincent William, D.D., fourteen years Bishop of Mauritius, at Stanhope Rectory, on the 11th inst., aged 71.
Sayres, Rev. Edward, thirty-seven years Rector of Cold Ashton, at Cold Ashton Rectory, Gloucestershire, on the 11th inst., aged 72.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DIVINE SIMILITUDE IN MAN.

BY THE REV. CHARLES RICHARD PANTER,
M.A., LL.D.

PREACHED IN SWIFT'S ALLEY CHURCH, ARCH-
DIOCESE OF DUBLIN.

"This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him."—GEN. v. 1.

THE fifth chapter of Genesis is "*the book*" specified in the text. It contains a sketch of the genealogical tree of Adam's race to the period of the Deluge. In this imperishable monograph is traced to its Divine source the primeval pedigree of the human family. Scriptural ethnology is equally concise, plain, and positive in declaring the Divine origin of man. "The book of the generations of Adam" ascribes the entity of our race to an act of its Maker, resulting in intermutual similitude; and there is no link but the link of his Creator's Almighty Volition between Adam and God. In the ensuing discourse, the design is not to meet objections or assumptions, contravening the scientific or historic statements couched in the Pentateuch. Nor is it proposed to consider whether Adam means the *first* man created, or the first man of a *special* race of men—whether races anterior to the Adamic, and adapted to prior conditions of the earth, had been created—whether there have been several and separate human, animal, and vegetable creations upon the face of our globe; and whether or not, such views as those just enumerated may be gathered from the Pentateuch. My desire is to indicate from analogy, based upon the adamant support of Holy Writ, how we are to understand that man was made in the likeness of God. For when Scripture speaks Analogy echoes her voice.

It is affirmed in the genealogical table drawn up in the third chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, that Adam "was the son of God"; but, in distinction to the Creator-Sonship of the Only-Begotten Son of God, man's Divine rank is that of *created sonship*. Upon this created sonship God was pleased to stamp His own image and likeness; that is to say, He endowed man with His own attributes, His activities, His beatitudes, and His dominion, in a degree most real although infinitely limited. No higher patent of nobility to created being than these endowments conferred, could issue from the

Universal Sovereign, consolidated into one royal charter, signed by the Hand of Elohim, and impressed with the signet of His Divine image and superscription. How can we conceive the idea of this real although infinitely limited likeness between the Creator and the creature? We may conceive it by comparing the likeness to that subsisting between a drop of water and an illimitable ocean. A unit of water is like the ocean in liquidity, and also in being the centre of life and activity—infinitesimal and evanescent as are that unit's life and activity. The unit of water if left alone is powerless, and would exhale or stagnate to death; but, joined to the mighty ocean, it preserves its liquidity, its purity, and its vitality. And so is the littleness of man made great by being absorbed in the greatness of God.

The earliest account of man's first appearance upon the earth is communicated by the inspired lawgiver, Moses; and without considering the special illumination of his mind from the Source of Light, it is a fact defying dispute, that the aptitude of Moses for the office of historian of primitive man was as much superior, as his advantages were greater, than are those of our modern speculators, who give such light wing to specious, mindspun theories regarding man's initial causation. These his incontrovertible advantages were; that he lived nearly three thousand five hundred years nearer to the epoch of Adam than we live—living when Tradition was in her adolescence, and ere she had become enfeebled and dimmed by age: for Tradition in the day of Moses, was not a mere bleached, mouldering skeleton, but was clothed with the flesh and the sinews of living, true history. Another advantage he had was, that as he belonged to the lineage of Levi, he must have been thoroughly instructed in the history, oral and written, of the Israelitish race, tracing up to the time of its great progenitor, Shem, the son of Noah. And again, he had the further advantage of receiving a royal education at the Court of Egypt, and therefore he must have been versed in the historic lore and wisdom of the Egyptian people, reaching up to the time of Mizraim, the founder of an early Egyptian monarchy, and the son of Ham and grandson of Noah. Accordingly, Moses held in his hand two independent chains of coeval history, either of them converging in Noah, in whom they interlinked, and proceeded onwards in a single chain of ten historic links (ten generations) to Adam. So that Adam, who may be justly designated the living witness of God, was, through Noah and two of Noah's lines of descendants, the historic witness to Moses, that man was made in "the likeness of God." And who bore witness to Adam whence his being originated? To Adam, the marvel of God's creation, was revealed by the Word whose power made him, his human identity and the Divine similitude in which it had pleased his Creator to make him. In the

memories of the ante-flood generations, the account of their origin rendered by the first of their number, Adam, must have lingered with wondrous vividness and been engraven with ineffaceable fidelity. And how valuable the evidence of long-lived generations, such as were theirs, over that of short-lived ; because with the former, facts are less liable to suffer from mutation and mutilation than they are when passing through the ever-varying medium of many and brief generations. Thus it appears that apart from his divine inspiration, Moses had historic witness of man's origin summoned to bear record from the first peal of the Adamic chronology. Not more wonderful was it that he should possess in an era when lived, as lives not now, Tradition in the full strength and comeliness of her youth—in an era when books were stones graven with the pen of iron ;—not more wonderful was it, I repeat, that Moses should possess a veritable record of “the generations of Adam,” than is it, that we ourselves possess at the present era the genuine Pentateuch of the Lawgiver.

Now in what way are we to understand man's similitude to his Maker? The similitude arises from the fact that God endowed man, at creation, with gifts proceeding from His own essence—emanations of God's own characteristics—which gifts, neither angel, nor man, nor any created intelligence can bestow upon any others. For God alone possesses these characteristics essentially ; men and angels communicatedly, not communicatively. Jehovah's gifts of likeness to Himself consist of attributes (instance, immortality as one) ; of beatitudes (instance, love of goodness, which is spiritual beauty, and all the blessedness springing from goodness, such as love, joy, truth, and peace) ; of activities (instance, man's power to subdue the earth, and adapt her natural forces to his use) ; and of dominion (instance, man's authority for the purpose of civil government over man, and the inherent power which all men wield over the brute creation).

As God Himself has almighty dominion over the material and spiritual constitutions of His boundless universe, so He gifted man with power within the sphere of his environments, over the little world of his day, moral and physical ; and in this limited but real degree, consigned to His own-imagined creature the vice-regency within an orbit which He made to be instinctively subject to man. Now the nobler dominionship of man is over man, and “The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.” (2 Sam. xxiii. 2.) But the noblest rulership of all is the power given by God to man to rule himself ; and the man who rules himself is a greater ruler than the man ruling men. “He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty ; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city.” (Prov. xvi. 32.) Dominion over the earth, dominion over men,

dominion over one's own spirit, are all of God. “For there is no power but of God.”

As the power man exercises over himself, over his fellow-man, and over animate nature, comprises his divine gift of dominion ; so his activities are represented by the arts and sciences he practises in order to subdue and accommodate inanimate nature, her forces and her stores, to his purposes ;—making bye-laws under the great general laws which God has established for upholding the constitution of the world. Man, by means of his activities, can give shape and qualities to the materials at his hand ; manipulating them until the objects he frames are very unlike the materials of which they are made. By transmuting or modifying matter, he can make it assume other shapes and qualities ; he can, in effect, reproduce it under other different aspects. The activity of God only can call matter and spirit out of nothing—create. He alone can evanish matter and spirit into nothing—annihilate ; for while creation and annihilation are the prerogatives of God, manipulation and mutation are the properties of man. Consider the power for beneficence deputed to human intelligence : regard the careful physician as he skilfully trims, adjusts, and arrests the wasting taper of life, imparting to it for a time a clearer and more steady flame. There he stands, the embodiment of benevolent activity, his intelligence securing to a fellow-creature renewed strength and length of days. Consider, in contrast, another, a dark, forbidding picture—a painful presentment from which who would not fain turn away?—the picture of the unhappy suicide or homicide, exerting the destructive activity permitted to man, and with guilty violence madly extinguishing the lamp of life, ere is spent the natural substance that fed its sacred flame :—

Activities for good, and eke for ill,—
The born inheritance of man's free-will ;
In choice to him alone to wear was given
The chain of Death, or win the crown of Heaven.

Now, it is obvious that the first Adam being *formed* in the likeness of God in respect to His beatitudes of love of goodness and righteousness, the lost impression of the Divine likeness can only be resealed by the renewed Adam being *conformed* to the likeness of the only-begotten Son of God. Only by the transference of Christ's nature to ours, and by our nature being incorporated with Christ's—“we in Him and He in us”—can the impression of the likeness of God be revived in any soul of man—can the intermutual similitude be reciprocated between God and man through the God-Man, to be perfected when this mortal shall be cited to put on immortality. In Eden, the loveliest feature in the Divine image that man bore was his love of goodness. What the smile is to the countenance of beauty, this heavenly spiritual attraction, this love of goodness, was to the whole nature of unfallen man ; irradiating and

glorifying every other moral perfection of his being; intensifying the glow of pleasure that felicitated his every thought; impermeating with the perfume of holiness his every word; and exalting to zeal the vigour of his every action. But soon, too soon, the tarnish of temptation tainted and blurred, and the ceaseless attrition of sin wore away, more and more, the perfection of the Holy effigy stamped upon human nature. Where the smile of goodness once reposed, the dark lour of depravity now looms; where the glow of pleasure once beamed, the distortion of pain now distresses; and the erewhile sanctuary of speech is invaded by the unholy legions of malice, deceit, swollen pride, wrathful strife, and other evil kin-affections; and for lack of the Divine favour that nerved his pristine vigour, man's strength of will has become weak and palsied. Oh! how very far gone is man from original righteousness! Oh! how hath the mighty fallen, fallen, fallen!

The natural man hath not now the love of goodness—how can he have it?—since “he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God.” The spiritual likeness to God in His beatitudes of love of goodness and rightecusness, we can only reflect when our spiritual natures are renewed in the beauty of holiness, by being conformed to the image of Him who is the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person; yet, Who was made in the likeness of men, to restore vicariously man's original estate; by His death to abolish death, the penalty of sin; and by His resurrection to bring life and immortality to light, and the restitution to man of his forfeited charter to that life and to that immortality.

It well beseems us to inquire, as a practical test of our own hope of eternal life, in what manner do those who are one with Christ reflect the lustre of His image? The answer is, by the light of the Holy Spirit, which is the Spirit of Christ, shining upon that spiritual prism, the conscience, heart, and mind of the believer, and thence radiating in lines of light—beams of love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, and faith; enlivening the believer's own heavenly hope, and diffusing a salutary influence upon all those within their radius. When those emanations of the Paraclete descend, and commingle their virtues in the soul, transfusing the whole nature, the desires of the flesh languish and decline, and the wings of the spirit fledge to pinion their flight to the spheres of a glorified immortality.

Powerless as human dominion, activities, and beatitudes are to exercise themselves as living forces in the realm of the past, yet how potent are they to live and work in the domain of the present, severally working that work which the hand findeth to do; and, by prescience, how readily can they adapt themselves to the requirements of the future,

and provide to meet its wants. This instinctive power to perceive and to provide for the wants of the future is one intimation to us of man having been created for an ever-abiding futurity. The dual faculties of consciousness and memory, which convince us of the reality of that never-changing vital agent inhabiting and governing the environments of its ever-changing mental organisation, and transient tenement of mortal clay: the moral sense, that inspired instructor of the will, so capable of discerning right from wrong: and reason, that divine-anointed monarch, enthroned in the wisdom-seat of man—all conspire to assure us of our soul's endless continuity, of our spirits being like His Who made us, immortal in their origin, immortal in their destiny. Consciousness and memory, the moral sense and reason are, one and all, God's invisible but felt prompters, forcing upon us the value of an everlasting, happy hereafter; and admonishing us that since the struggle of our present life is a struggle for present happiness, so immeasurably dearer, in the ratio of its value ought to be our strife for the attainment of eternal joy. His attribute of immortality, God's Eternal Spirit communicated to our race when he breathed into Adam the breath of life, and man became a living soul, created at God's pleasure for immortal pleasure. And again, in the fulness of time, the Incarnate Word confirmed to man the Divine spiritual attribute of immortality when He breathed upon His disciples, saying, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost,”—the Holy Ghost by whose inspiring influence of life, man shall be restored to his original divine similitude in the perfection of all its glorious attributes of immortality, spiritual beauty, and heavenly, instead of earthly, power and dominion. In that condition, the glorified, spiritual body shall reflect in the full majesty of man the image of the invisible God. For as Jesus Christ bore our earthly image, so shall we bear His heavenly likeness. As it is written: “And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.” (1 Cor. xv. 49.) And, “Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright.” (Eccles. vii. 29.) And again, “I shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness.” (Psalm xvii. 15.)

AN example of kindly courtesy to his Nonconformist brethren has just been shown by the vicar of the village of Morden, in Surrey. A Nonconformist parishioner having died, the Baptist minister of Easthill, Wandsworth, had been invited to conduct the funeral; and as there was no dissenting chapel near, the preliminary service had been arranged to take place in the house of the deceased. The vicar, on learning this, at once proffered the use of the church; and the service was conducted in that building by the Dissenting minister above mentioned. —*British Weekly.*

RUTH—SYMPATHY.

BY THE REV. CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH,
RECTOR OF GLASTON, UPPINGHAM, PREBEN-
DARY OF LIDDINGTON.

SERMON, ADDRESSED TO WOMEN, PREACHED AT
GLASTON.

"And Ruth said, Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God; where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried: the LORD do so to me, and more also, if ought but death part thee and me."—RUTH i. 16, 17.

THESE words of Ruth (if I mistake not) have been set to music. At all events, they have a sweet native music of their own, in our authorised Bible, on which (as I see) the revisers of our English Version have not thought that they could improve.

These beautiful words have (I dare say), a thousand times supplied language to lovers plighting their troth to each other. They seem to us to express that devotion of heart that should exist between man and wife.

But we ought not to forget that these words were not, in the first instance, uttered by one "lover" to another, in the ordinary sense of the word, but they were spoken by one widow to another widow, by a middle-aged, though beautiful woman, who had been married about ten years, to her mother-in-law, the aged Naomi.

It seems difficult sometimes to remember that there is very strong affection, very ardent devotion, not only between the youth and his maiden lover, or between married man and wife, but also between two persons of the same sex, and (it may be) of two different generations. The affection of betrothed or married persons ought, in fact, to be the anti-type of other affections and intimacies, as in its turn it is the type of "the mystical union," the sign and representation of "the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and His Church." There was something very touching in the character which the women of Bethlehem gave of Ruth, the Moabitish woman. Speaking to her mother-in-law Naomi, they called Ruth, "thy daughter-in-law which is better to thee than seven sons." Mothers have sometimes felt inclined either to be jealous of their sons' wives, or else to think somewhat slightly of them. But *here* was a case where the younger woman had *won* her mother-in-law's *heart* by her dutiful fidelity.

It is remarkable that this specially noteworthy case of exceeding affection was *not* found in the direct relationship of married life between a wife and a husband, though no doubt the remembrance of the departed husbands was one of the chief bonds between these women. Married people are inclined sometimes to behave as though all avenues

of affection might be closed for them, provided they are only constant in their mutual devotion to each other. It is possible to be selfish and unduly exclusive even in such hallowed love.

Holy matrimony ought to enable husbands and wives to extend the circuit of their charity. It is not to sanction their contracting it into a narrower compass. But yet it must *begin* in the natural order of the family as God Himself has constituted it. First the love between husband and wife, jealous with a godly jealousy, the one for the other's love and honour—"Godly jealousy," we may call it, in the sense in which God Himself is said to be jealous for the whole heart and life-service of each human soul which is His. And then from the love of man and wife, loving one another *in* God and Christ and in the unity of the Holy Ghost, and loving none else in comparison, *except* God Himself, we are meant to go on to the love of parent and child, and it may be children's children, as it were requiting our parents by loving *our* children as we remember that our fathers and mothers loved *us* when we were children.

And so by degrees to let love which has begun in the home shine forth to the neighbour and the friend. The love of God which was eternal in the heavens, has not *confined* itself to heaven. No, the ever-blessed Trinity made the angels first, and then the living creatures upon the earth, and lastly *man*, to love and care for. And day by day throughout the world fresh lives are being sent forth to be fresh objects of the Fatherly Providence of Almighty God.

In our married life we ought to try to *extend*, rather than to limit, the bounds of Christian and godly sympathy, particularly with those of our own sex.

We find in the world that some people who know very little of God are *kind* and *sympathetic*. They are not, perhaps, a very large body in proportion to the number of those who are at least *selfish*, if not noticeably harsh and hard. There are *some* not merely good-tempered and easy-going people, but some actively benevolent, philanthropical and beneficent, as we say,—who are yet apparently irreligious, if not openly ungodly people. Now, this need not surprise us. For, though they know not God, it certainly does not follow that God does not know *them*. I have a beautiful Bible at home, but I never saw the man who gave it me. I knew a boy once who had many birthday presents; but he could not tell *who* had given most of them; and yet he made use of them quite freely. I do not, of course, mean that this was as it should be, simply that it was the case; and people who have the good gift of good nature or any other good and perfect gift from above, and yet do not acknowledge God the Giver of it, are like that boy. He enjoyed the gift, but did not know the giver.

We have a gracious sovereign, whose wise forethought has (under God) been the means of bestowing many blessings upon us as a nation. Yet

many among us have never beheld her countenance.

But we know that it is God who gives all good gifts and graces. Every virtue we possess—every virtue of which we are being possessed—comes down from the Father of lights, and is of the fruit of the Holy Spirit, freely given *with* Christ, the greatest gift of all.

There are whole tribes and nations which do not know of the gift of our Lord Jesus Christ, but none the less He has been *given*, and given for *them*; and for *His sake* grace reaches them even in uncovenanted ways.

How *much* then ought we to desire that they may have “more abundance” through the *appointed* channels and means of grace. How earnestly we who do know Him ought to pray that they who know Him *not* may receive that precious knowledge—that He would “send out” His “light and His truth,” and let them lead *them* and *us* till we are brought together unto His holy hill and to His dwelling!

Ruth, the Moabitess, had known, but little of the revelation of God. In her younger days she may have worshipped Chemosh, the abominable idol. Her friends and neighbours, if not she *herself*, may have been present at shameful scenes where wickedness was practised by the heathen under the name of religion, wickedness such as is practised in some places in Christian countries, only with the knowledge that it is the devil’s service, and *hateful* to Almighty God, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity with approval or with allowance.

But yet, while Ruth had small opportunities of learning about the true God, her sympathetic heart was open, and she was very apt to learn. When her mother-in-law, with mild tolerance, was urging her to return, with Orpah, to her country’s gods, Ruth chose the God of Israel for her God. His name “the LORD” (that is, Jehovah), *not* that of Chemosh—was instantly in her mouth. “The LORD do so to me, and more also, if ought but death part thee and me.”

And *so* she became ready, when the time came, to receive the blessing of Boaz. “The LORD recompense thy work, and a full reward be given thee of the LORD the God of Israel, under whose wings thou art come to take refuge.”

II. In the history and the character of Ruth you may note two things: (1) Her dutiful affection to her mother-in-law, coupled with a loving remembrance of her dead husband, and all that belonged to him. (2) Her turning from an idolatrous country and connexions to serve the true God. The former of these, Ruth’s duty to her mother-in-law, led to her piety towards God. In our Catechism you are taught to put the duty towards God before your duty towards your neighbour. So it is in the Ten Commandments. So it is in our Saviour’s summary of religious duty. That is the proper

order in regard to put God first. But, as in other things, the order of time is not the same as the order of dignity. In a procession those that come first are the inferior; those that follow are those of a higher place of honour. The Queen does not go first in her procession.

In school, our learning the alphabet and spelling came first; reading longer words and sentences came afterwards. The latter we practise all our life long. The former is one of the childish things which seem of secondary importance afterwards; and such elementary things, if once well acquired, seem to stick by us without our thinking much about it.

So it is that love and devotion and duty to God, though it is all of the highest importance, is commonly not the first thing gained in point of time; it is not learnt and practised until we have made some progress with our duty towards our neighbour.

Samuel knew Eli, and attended on him before he knew the LORD, and before he even became conscious that he was serving Him. Afterwards, no doubt, he found that in serving the LORD he was ministering to Eli, and that in doing Eli’s bidding, he was really ministering in the LORD’s service. Thus your duty towards God and your duty towards your neighbour in practice help one another. St. John has taught us that a man must love his brother whom he hath seen, before he can rightly talk of loving God whom he hath not seen. Only, he adds “This commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God love his brother also.” There can, at all events, be no better training for loving God than loving a husband, or a mother-in-law, or a child. How merciful is our Heavenly Father, who provides thus in the natural, almost instinctive, affections of human life, a training for the higher duties of earth and even of heaven itself!

I spoke of the sympathetic character of Ruth. Strictly speaking, sympathy means fellow-feeling, feeling with one. Sometimes, when you were in trouble, I dare say a friend has said, “I feel deeply for you;” “my heart bleeds for you.” That is very kind, and very good. We like our real friends to speak like that when we are in trouble. But how much more it means, if any one can truly say, “I feel *with* you,” “I know just what it all means, because I have felt it all myself.” If one can say, “I had just such a loss as you a year or two ago. And I must tell you the thing which gave me the greatest comfort was so and so.” And then if they tell you something to the purpose, that is true sympathy. Or even if our friend could name no remedy for our sorrow, the mere sight of another who had been by that dark way before, and the simple touch of a hand which had itself wiped away tears shed under like sorrows previously, would be in itself a consolation and support.

And surely this is what you all, and especially

you women may do. Ruth had been some time a widow; she had felt lonely; she had lost her dear one; she had suffered in the famine; she was able, and (what is more) she was ready, to feel with Naomi, and to help her, to work for her, to cheer her up when the sorrow of her bereavement came fresh upon her, and as the old sores re-opened on the occasion of her return to the scenes of her former happiness in Bethlehem-judah. And that is just what you can do. The younger may do it for the elder, as having health and strength. The elder may do much for the younger, as having experience. So Naomi helped Ruth, by providing her with a home for a time and by giving her some sensible advice in season, and by loving her, and then by helping her to nurse her first child.

I have known more than one woman who has taken care of a neighbour's children now and then, or has sat with an invalid while the mother has been set free to go to church once and again, or to the Lord's Table, which she had not been able to do since her family-ties had begun to keep her at home, until that friend enabled her to enjoy her Christian privilege. It is easy for you (and indeed for any of us) to miss little (and yet, indeed, they are great) opportunities of doing a sympathetic kindness to a neighbour. Yes! and even sometimes in your own home, I dare say, you have missed doing a kind action, simply from want of thought. God gave you your tender heart, so that you might be able to comfort and console others in any trial or trouble, and to do it with the comfort and consolation wherewith you yourself have been comforted and consoled; yes, even, perhaps, that you may supply to others that word of kindness, advice, encouragement, and sympathy, which you once, in a similar case, longed for so wistfully, but longed in vain. Cannot some of you think over for the good of your younger neighbours what you would have liked said and done for yourself when you had young children, or children entering into the trials and temptations of life? Can you not—even the younger as well as the elder—think over your own youth and childhood, and so be, perhaps, a little more sympathetic with the children and the generations which are coming on as you once came on? Do not forget that you were once light-hearted and forgetful, and full of play, if not of mischief, yourself.

And there is sympathy also to be exercised towards brothers or husbands, or those in the same generation as yourself, and also towards your elders. You cannot feel with *them* exactly by experience. But God has given you women a woman's wit to feel, by a sort of human instinct, in what, and when you can help and cheer them. If you see that they are worn and worried, you will try to cheer them, and to make home happy with a bright face, though it may be with a sad heart within. I am sure Ruth must have done

that. Surely home is the best place for them. Do what you can to make them feel that there is no place like their home. It will be so much in favour of it becoming so to them, the best place in the world, except the comfort of your Father's House, if they have trouble out of doors—provided only that you make them welcome and (as far as may be) comfortable. When you see a man in low spirits, do not at once begin upon your own trouble. Or if there is something which cannot wait, do not fling it at him as if it were chiefly his fault that you have your troubles. Rather tell him that you want to know if he can help you.

I said that sympathy is not only feeling for another, or for others, but feeling with them. You remember of whom it is written, "Himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses." He "carried our sorrows." And, best of all, He took up and bore away our sins in His own Body on the Tree. He was in all points tried and tempted like as we are.

God would not simply feel for us, and pity us. He did that: but He did more. God the Son felt with us. He took of the substance of His Blessed Mother, the maiden of David's house (and so from Ruth of Bethlehem), a rational or reasonable soul. Therefore

In every pang that rends the heart
The Man of Sorrows bore a part.'

He received also from her life, a human Body. In the pains and distresses of our bodies

Christ leads us through no darker rooms
Than He went through before.

He felt poverty, and hunger, and thirst, and heat and cold, sleeplessness, nakedness, and the agony of a protracted death. He had sick friends and friends bereaved. He wailed and lamented over Jerusalem for sorrow of heart. He entered the house of mourning at Bethany, as well as the house of feasting at Cana. He shed tears where His friend Lazarus had been recently buried. He knew what it was to be falsely betrayed and timidly forsaken. He felt what it was to have a last parting from a bosom-friend and a beloved mother. Doubtless He had the assistance of heavenly succour to support Him in His hour of human sorrow and depression. He had them, so that you too may hope and pray for them. But He felt most keenly the sorrows which make such succour needful. He knew what it is to faint beneath the Cross. He has known what it is to be an infant and a child, to have reached middle life, and to feel the sorrows of a long life in a few years.

You have, therefore, in Christ Jesus, of the seed of Ruth of Bethlehem, an example of sympathy exercised by one who has passed through the manifold experiences of a busy and (in one sense) of a lonely life, a life lacking many of the ordinary comforts and consolations of a home. He owned

no house or cottage where He might lay His Head. He knew not the pleasures of earthly fatherhood or of wedded love, though He hallowed them as types of heavenly relationship and union. And, what is more, He offers you those Divine and heavenly succours in virtue of His Incarnation. He gives you means of grace whereby you may have help sufficient for your own wants, and be enabled to succour others in your turn.

Do not, then, leave Him, or return back from following Him. Ye will not go away. "Lord, to Whom shall we go? Thou hast the Words of Eternal Life. Thy Word is 'Take, eat, this is My Body. Abide in Me, and let My word abide in you. I go unto My Father and your Father, unto My God and your God. Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'"

THE Rev. J. S. Teulon, M.A., was installed as a Residentiary Canon in Chichester Cathedral on Friday the 20th inst., in the place of the Rev. W. Awdry, who resigned on the previous day. Canon Teulon became Vice-Principal of Chichester Theological College in 1875, and succeeded Mr. Awdry as Principal in 1887; the latter retains his connection with the cathedral as Prebendary of Exceit.

It is proposed this term to revive the evening sermons for Oxford undergraduates at St. Mary's, which were started a few years back by the late president of Trinity with excellent effect. Mr. Ffoulkes, the vicar of St. Mary's, has, we think, very wisely left the selection of the preachers in the hands of a committee mainly composed of the undergraduates themselves. The preachers whom they have selected and who are announced for the coming six Sundays of term, are the following:—Mr. Dolling, the energetic superintendent of the Winchester Mission at Southsea, Mr. Aubrey Moore, Mr. Billing, the Dean of Salisbury, and the Bishops of Carlisle and Peterborough. A more thoroughly representative list it would have been difficult to draw up; and it is to be hoped that the forthcoming series of sermons will be as well attended as were the original courses.

THERE appears in the *Oxford Gazette* this week an unpretentious but useful little statute making some changes in the Latin service with which each term is opened. That service, as many of your readers are doubtless aware, consists of three parts—the Latin Litany, chanted by the two Proctors, or their deputy; a Latin sermon, delivered by a preacher specially nominated; and the Communion in Latin, celebrated by the Vice-Chancellor, or his deputy. The chief change which the new statute proposes to introduce, is to enable the Vice-Chancellor at his discretion to vary the time for the celebration of the Holy Communion, so that it need no longer be fixed for the same time as the chanting of the Litany and delivery of the sermons. As a rule the Vice-Chancellor will probably generally fix an early morning hour for the celebration; and it is hoped that this change may greatly improve the attendance, which is at present generally very scanty. The time for the chanting of the Litany and for the sermon will probably remain unaltered.



NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 6d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1888.

OUR CATHEDRALS.

THERE are many parts of the ecclesiastical structure, which will have to be dealt with in a scheme of Church Reform; and among them will be the collegiate churches, and the cathedrals of England. The main idea of the Cathedral is that of the central church of the Diocese, with the Bishop as the head, resident in the close, and surrounded by his chapter, as his advisers. The continuous sacrifice of prayer and praise daily offered within its sacred walls, the school or college for students in theology; in a word, the cathedral as the centre of the higher life, the one point to which all should tend, the Mother Church, the place for spiritual refreshment, is a beautiful ideal, but it is one which is only partially carried out at the present day. As the centres of religious life, we are afraid that many of our cathedral cities cannot boast of being this. Some are dreary and dull in the extreme; while some of the larger ones are remarkable for returning radical members to Parliament, and quite recently we have had the spectacle of a good and worthy Dean* entertaining a member of the National League, and in other ways helping the Liberal party during a contested election. With regard to the Bishops, we know that several of them do not live in their cathedral cities, but at some distance away, for instance, the Bishop of St. Alban's lives at Danbury, the Bishop of Winchester at Farnham Castle, and the Archbishop of York at Bishopthorpe. While it may be urged that these are historic see-houses, and we believe that Farnham Castle has been attached to the bishopric of Winchester ever since the time of King Stephen, or thereabouts, yet they do not help to bring home the original idea of the

* Winchester.

Bishop living in his city where 'is his *cathedra*. With regard to the daily sacrifice of prayer and praise, which is to be offered, we think that this could be done for a great deal less money, and that the money thus saved might with advantage be used for other and more pressing needs of the Church. For instance, we have in our minds a cathedral city, which, in reality, is little more than a decent-sized country town, and excepting the interest attached to the historic pile, there is little else to attract, and certainly not enough to employ the three or four minor canons, and the four residentiary canons even when these latter are resident only three months in the year, and each of them has his house in the close. If there must be residentiary canons (as we suppose there must), according to the ancient statutes, then we think that they should have some specified work given them to do, in connection with the Diocese, either as missionaries, school inspectors, or working some special phase of Church organisation in the Diocese, and that they should be more than mere figures in the cathedral procession, to be in residence certain months in the year, and having to preach a certain number of sermons. We believe that Cranmer's idea was that there should be a theological school attached to each cathedral, but this idea has never been carried out until within the last few years, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, when Chancellor of Lincoln, started the Chancellor's school of theology, and also a similar school has been opened at Truro, under the superintendence of the Chancellor of the Diocese, and we see no reason why this should not be done in connection with other cathedrals; *not* that they are to take the place of the universities, but that they shall supply that definite and special training which does not come within the province of the university training. The Bishop of Lichfield, in his recent pastoral, has urged that candidates for holy orders should, after taking their degree, spend a year at a theological college, so as to gain more professional training, and that a longer time should elapse between taking the degree and the day of ordination; but the question of ways and means blocks the way.

It is a fact, and we say it in no captious spirit, far from it, that our Cathedral Chapters, with their officials, cost a great deal of money for which we should like to see a more adequate return. It is true that in many cathedrals depression has set its mark, and is being felt very keenly. On the other hand, there are others where this has not been felt, *i.e.*, where the stipends are paid by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, but when the pruning-knife is applied, we believe that it will cut very deeply, and in order to avoid this, we would urge that Cathedral Chapters should try to make fuller proof of their mission, and so help to establish more firmly than ever the Church's influence throughout the various dioceses and the kingdom at large.

A FEW WORDS ON THE QUESTION OF TITHE-RENT CHARGE.

BY A LAYMAN.

THE question of the payment of Tithe-rent charge is causing great heart-burning between the Landowners, the Farmers and the Clergy; whilst, in my judgment, the class which ought to be the most prominent in the matter prudently keeps in the back-ground—I mean the general public.

Prior to the repeal of the Corn Laws, the Commuted Tithe-rent Charge was, I submit, borne neither by the landlord nor the tenant, but by the people who consumed the produce of the land.

It is true the Tithe was collected from the farmer, or if he refused payment, it was collected by a distress on the produce and stock on the land, but the Tithe was never, nor is now, in a strict sense, a charge upon the land itself.

The Tithe-owner cannot sell the land in default of payment of the Tithe, nor can he maintain an action for it against either the landlord or tenant. The remedy is simply by distress on what may be found upon the land; and even this remedy is limited to two years' arrear of Tithe, beyond which period the Tithe-owner has no remedy.

Should no distress be found on the land, the Tithe-owner may take possession, and let the land till his two years' arrears are satisfied.

If the land, as is now frequently the case, be unlettable, and there be nothing to distress on, the Tithe-rent charge is absolutely irrecoverable.

This shows clearly, therefore, that the so-called rent charge is one of a very limited and precarious nature.

To revert to the Tithe being paid by the people, and not by the landowner or the tenant.

The Tithe-commutation is based on the average market value of corn. Before the repeal of the Corn Laws the market value of corn was regulated by the amount which the farmer had to recoup himself for outlay in his business, and this consisted of rent, Tithes, rates and taxes, cost of labour, and a fair rate of interest and remuneration for capital and time employed in the business. These added together made up the market value, and the consumers of the produce paid the whole.

Now, the market value of corn is fixed, not by the outlay of the farmer and his reasonable profit, but by the lowest price at which similar produce can be put upon our markets by the foreigner, and the consequence has been the universal ruin of the landed and farming interests in this country.

For a time it was attempted to show that the cause of the depression arose from bad seasons. No one, however, now seriously supports this view.

For the purposes of the present question, there are two classes of land to be considered—the one free of Tithe, and the other subject to Tithe-rent charge. The cry is, that whatever reduction is made in Tithes, or if they should be abolished, the Landlords alone would be the gainers.

Now, had the Tithe-rent Charge been reduced or abolished prior to the abolition of the Corn Laws, this would have been true, because, as I have before shown, at that time the Tithe did not come out of the pocket either of the landlord or the tenant, but was borne by the consumer.

Since the abolition of the Corn Laws, however, as

the Tithe has been abstracted from the Landlord, it is only right that this wrong should be remedied by the burthen of the Tithe being removed from the shoulders of the landlord, which, speaking plainly, can only be done honestly in one of two ways, viz., 1—By making the Tithes a charge on the National Debt ; or, 2—By providing for the Clergy by a tax on imported produce.

I am not sanguine in the belief that either of these modes will be adopted.

The truth is, that it has always been a convenient mode of collecting the Tithe, to take it from the growers of the produce ; but the Church exists for the benefit of the people, and they it is who ought to pay, and who until recently did pay, the Tithe.

The assessment of Tithe upon, and the collection of it from, the people individually, would be a matter of impossibility.

There is another difficulty attending the Tithe question, and that is the want of power to redeem it. Unless land is being dealt with for building purposes, I believe there is no power to redeem the tithe, and in any event it must be redeemed on the basis of the original commuted amount without regard to its diminished value, and then at something like thirty years' purchase. This evidently requires alteration. The commutation—now about fifty years old—has worked in favour of the Tithe-owner so far, that it has averaged for fifty years £2 per cent. per annum above par. In other words, for every £100 of Tithe the Tithe-owner has received, and the Tithe-payer paid, £100 premium on every £100 of original commuted Rent charge.

It is somewhat remarkable that whilst Tithe-owners treat the Tithe Commutation Act of 1836 as having been a final and irrevocable settlement of the question, it should have escaped their notice that within three years after the passing of the Tithe Commutation Act, a Tithe Amendment Act was passed (2 and 3 Vict., c. 62) for the relief amongst other things of fruit growers, in consequence of the then recent repeal of the duties on foreign fruit which it was thought would have the effect of throwing fruit-growing land out of cultivation.

Under the 3 and 4 Wm. IV., c. 56, the Custom Duties on Foreign Fruits were as follows :—

Apples	...	...	4s. od. per bushel.
Pears	...	...	7s. 6d. "
Cherries	...	...	18s. 8d. per cwt.

and on nuts and walnuts, 2s. per bushel.

By the 1 and 2 Vict., the above duties were repealed and replaced by an *ad valorem* duty of £5 per cent.

To meet this altered state of circumstances, the Tithe Amendment Act of 1839 gave the Tithe Commissioners discretionary power to fix the extraordinary tithe on fruit, instead of its being fixed on an average of the prices of fruit for the preceding seven years as provided by the Tithe Commutation Act of 1836, and which would have been manifestly unfair when the Duties in force when the Tithe Commutation Act was passed had been repealed, and Free Trade in fruit had been practically established.

In his treatise on the Tithe Amendment Act of 1839, Mr. Whalley of the Tithe Office says, alluding to the above alteration, that "this Provision was introduced for the special purpose of relieving those lands which by the repeal of the duty on foreign fruit it is expected will be thrown out of cultivation, and to that extent it bears against the tithe-owner ; but the

relief of such lands from their Fruit Charge was so absolutely demanded by every consideration of fairness and policy, that it must have been afforded even if this provision had not been introduced."

If Free Trade in fruit caused an alteration to be made as a matter of equity in the case of fruit growing land by parity of reasoning, another alteration should have been made in favour of corn-growing lands when Free Trade in corn was established.

It is felt by a large number of people that the Tithe Commutation Act of 1836 should not be treated as an absolutely unalterable arrangement, and the circumstances attending the Tithe Amendment Act above referred to, coupled with the great depreciation of land and its products which are now sorely trying both landlords and tenants, appear to be quite consistent with this view of the case.

In a large number of cases, the Church is endowed with Glebe-lands instead of Tithe, and I am by no means certain that an equitable remedy for the present state of things may not be found in this direction : viz., by giving up to the Church a fair proportion of the lands now subject to tithe, and freeing the remainder of such estates from further claim.

One thing now is pretty certain, and that is, that land subject to Tithe-rent charge has been rendered in many cases almost valueless, by reason of certain Acts of Parliament passed since the Tithe Commutation Act. The question of Tithe rent-charge will itself have to be reconsidered and dealt with in accordance with the altered state of circumstances now existing.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE ARCHBISHOP TRENCH.

ON January 20th, 1888, was unveiled in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, a memorial brass, erected to the late Dr. Trench, Archbishop of Dublin. Lord Plunket, the present Archbishop, delivered to a large congregation an eloquent and feeling address. The concise and elegant Latin inscription by the Rev. Dr. Scott, Archdeacon of Dublin, is as follows :—

In piam memoriam
RICARDI CHÉNEVIX TRENCH, S.T.P.
per annos xxi. Archiep. Dublin, qui fidem Christi sinceram,
Antistes, Doctor, Poeta illustravit corde, coluit moribus, ornavit
in vitam transivit amplio rem ante diem v. kalendas Apriles
A.D. MDCCCLXXXVI. ætatis lxxix. Clerici sui et Laici
posuerunt.

The struggling soul its chrysalis of clay
Hath cleft, and Godward plumed its peaceful way
To the Glory-clime :
To live the spirit-life in aye
Of that New Birth begun in Time.

Within the Empire's fane his hallowed bed
Of resurrection* 'midst the mighty dead ;
Where he oft times trod,
And full on moral darkness shed.
The love-light of his Saviour-God.

The Book that speaks th' Eternal Sovereign's Will,
The Master-guide,—infused the grace-wrought skill
Of the scholar-bard ;
Till sense and soul with Heaven athrill,
He ripened to his great reward.

* The early Irish Christians called their graves the places of their resurrection.

And rich the mind Experience stored with thought ;
 And meek the spirit Godly grace had wrought
 In the prelate-saint ;
 With love humane his heart was fraught,
 And pure of Envy's leprous taint.

His thoughts, like seedlings cast abroad, took root
 In other minds, and bloomed and yielded fruit
 Of their several kind ;
 And multiform and -fold shall shoot,
 To deck the ethic-field of Mind.

His hand no chary charity restrained ;
 His heart unheeded heard not, nor unpained,
 The lament of need ;
 And brighter than the gold he rained.
 The motive that impelled the deed.

To him, whose Staff a double-decade swayed
 The triple See, this votive verse be paid,
 By the tongue of sooth ;—
 Not lipped by fraudulent Flattery's aid,
 To anoint his memory with untruth.

CHARLES RICHARD PANTER,
 Clk., M.A., LL.D.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND
 ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

BETWEEN TWO STOOLS.

SIR,—The Bishop of Gloucester's last pastoral has been widely quoted in its concluding paragraphs. For a very cautious man, who takes in the position of "our unhappy divisions," to speak out from his position as one of the bishops of long standing and mark, and from a growing sense of the Church's danger by reason of her want of cohesion in her public ministration, is surely a sign of the gravity of the evils the bishop complains of—a clear sign that at least one bishop discerns the rocks ahead, that one bishop thinks he ought to speak out. The sense of duty, which prompts a leading dignitary to speak out, is painfully clear. The question is, will his lordship's pastoral satisfy any reader, who expects the author to point out a clear and hopeful way out of our divisions? It will look to some, I fear, a hopeless attempt to "sit on two stools"!

If anyone will carefully read and re-read the prefaces to our Book of Common Prayer, he will be struck by the curious recurrence of the wave of superstition. The writers of those prefaces, put aside "the new fangled uses" which superstition had introduced ; our good diocesan cannot go so far.

The pastoral alluded to hopes that Convocation might be allowed a free hand in doctoring rubrics (*which, and how many are not mentioned*), by the legislature ; but our Book of Common Prayer was sanctioned by a very different legislature to what we now have, and did *not* sanction "superstitious uses." Allusion is made to omissions on the part of some clergy to carry out the rubrics—what these are we have to find out. The bishop admits that very seldom have complaints been made on this head. It is regrettable that the omissions in disobeying rubrics thus were not named. The writer of the pastoral we honour for his private worth and for his public services. He has not only been long before the public, but from his length of experience of the recalcitrant clergy, his view as to any *modus vivendi* ought to command respect.

Notwithstanding his lordship's long experience of the clergy of England, he is sanguine enough to think that if the large number who are indulging in superstitious practices and preaching Romanism could have some rope given them, by alteration of the rubrics they deemur to, then we should have peace at home ; and where divergency still occurred, those clergy would submit to the godly admonition of the ordinary ! Is this likely from past experience. The proper course would be, for the whole Bench of Bishops to agree on a *Revised Prayer Book*, and to give the Church the benefit of their united wisdom.

A. D. P.

BEWARE OF ODIUM THEOLOGICUM.

SIR,—After laying down the *Quarterly Review* for this month, which, pp. 259-262 gives a picture of Irish Nationalist manners in the house, I took up "B.'s" letter in your last number. I ask, is not this too much in the Tanner style, so disgraceful to Ireland in the House of Commons? Cannot gentlemen reason like gentlemen? Is divinity to turn us into fishwives? Is Billingsgate a part of even the clerical Irish language? I protest against "B.'s" personal abuse of Canon Crosthwaite, who treats his opponents with courtesy and fair arguments, never with insult. Whatever may be the case in Ireland, the Canon's contention and logical arguments are much needed in England.

MEDICUS.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." January, 1888. London, Hodder & Stoughton.

ARCHDEACON FARRAR'S paper on Characteristics of Modern English Exegesis, contains little or no information. It is, moreover, unfortunate that he should have such a contempt for the ancients, especially the schoolmen. No doubt the schoolmen and their writings are dead ; but they were really alive once, for they did good work in their time, and need not therefore be buried afresh under a load of uncomplimentary epithets. We also find the verb "extravagate" for the first time, and we hope the last. Dr. Farrar says of the Apocalypse, "I venture to think that another generation will have fully accepted its origin in the reign of Vespasian, and will have found the clue to many of its symbols in the events of the Neronian persecution and the epoch which immediately succeeded it." Now if Dr. Farrar will turn on to page 67, he will find Professor Godet saying, "It will one day be seen that it is an utter mistake to place the date of the Apocalypse before the fall of Jerusalem. M. Harnach himself now places the date . . . under Domitian, that is, at the close of the first century." We thought, moreover, ourselves that Dr. Salmon had quite slain the absurd idea that the whole book is aimed at Nero.

Professor Cheyne discusses Ps. xxiii. 3, xlviii. 2, Is. xxix. 1, 2, xxxiii. 7, as to the probability of their containing—or at any rate alluding to—mythic phraseology. The paper is very able—students of Isaiah and the Psalms should note it for reference.

We rather dislike the paper on Professor Davidson

—it reads like a funeral sermon on somebody who is not yet dead.

Professor Godet writes on the Pastoral epistles, compressing a great deal of argument and conjecture into very forcible language.

Altogether though it is a good number, it is not quite up to the *Expositor's* level.

PROFESSOR PATERSON ON PEACE.—In a sermon preached by Professor Paterson, of the United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh, in St. George's Church, Montrose, recently, he said :—"Some say that war is a necessity, and at times even a benefit ; others that it is never a necessity, and that though it were, it could not be a benefit. The latter are right, though we must sorrowfully acknowledge that they are at present in a miserable minority, even among Christians. Who, then, are to blame for such a state of opinion in the visible Church of Christ ? Why, the ministers of the Gospel first, and the Christian laity next. On this subject, Christians have not only not carried their theory into practice, but have been afraid even to state the theory itself. Had ministers been bold enough to preach as possible what the Bible declares to be possible, can there be a doubt that such preaching would have been effectual ? Yet how few ministers venture to raise their voices in public when a fit of Jingoism sweeps over the nation, and brings out all its worst and most unchristian characteristics ? How few have joined the Peace Society themselves, or ever encouraged their people to join it. Is the foreign policy of Britain, during the past fifty years, such as a clear-sighted Christian, with the Bible open before him, can approve of ? Who can say that it is ? Yet, thanks be unto God, even in this there are indications of a growing tendency to move in the right direction. The settlement of the "Alabama" question by arbitration marks, let us hope, the beginning of a new era, in which international disputes will be settled without recourse to the rough and rude arbitrament of war.

"The development of the religious conscience is as marked a feature of Christianity as is the development of civilisation itself. That wonderful book the Bible, though written so many generations ago, has never yet been fully understood, nor the logical outcome of the principles it enunciates realised. It is not a generation since Christian ministers, educated quite up to the standard of their time, proved, to the complete satisfaction of themselves and their hearers, that the Bible not only sanctioned slavery, but enjoined it, and that to set slaves free was to fly in the face of God's own direct injunctions to man ; and yet, at the present moment, I do not believe that there is a single Christian in the whole world, either clergyman or layman, who would venture to maintain any such monstrous thesis. Accordingly, when we hear Christian ministers maintaining that war is right, and extolling in glowing periods its pomp and splendour, and doing everything in their power to give *éclat* to the army, and encourage men to devote their lives to a military career, we may draw comfort from the thought that it is not thirty years since there were equally eloquent and upright ministers advocating the maintenance of slavery. The Christian conscience having been so speedily educated on that subject, it is by no means unreasonable, is it, to infer that the education of Christians with reference to war, now that it has at all

events begun, will be equally certain ? "If you believe in the possibility of such a time, is it not your bounden duty to hasten its coming ? God does not work except by the co-operation of men ; and the reason why the good times so many of us hope for don't come is simply this : We confine ourselves to hoping and wishing for them, and then we fold our hands. We don't set about working for them. We don't do our part in trying to bring them ; therefore it is that the chariot of the Prince of Peace is so long in coming ; therefore it is that there are everywhere wars and rumours of war. In all probability the next wars will be more terrific and bloody than any that have ever occurred. I am convinced that it is the duty of each man and woman among us not only to pray that the blessed time may come, but to work for it. If all our representatives in Parliament were pledged to a peace policy, would not that be a long step towards such a consummation ? And have you not each of you at least some influence, however small, that will tend towards that ? "By so doing, you will show yourselves worthy subjects of Him who is the Prince of Peace, but who has not as yet entered into His full inheritance. May God enable us, each according to the ability He has granted us, to hasten that blessed time of 'peace on earth and goodwill to men.'"

A CORRESPONDENT writes :—It was with feelings of real sorrow that the parishioners of Rugeley heard of their vicar's (*Prebendary Grier's*) appointment to the living of Hednesford. Mr. Grier, who has worked in Rugeley for upwards of two-and-twenty years, is deservedly loved by his people. When the appointment was made known no time was lost in appealing to the Bishop. In a very few hours about 1,400 signatures, which were restricted to members of the congregation who had been confirmed, were obtained to a petition, which was forwarded to Lichfield on Monday, January 9th. On Friday, the 13th inst., the churchwardens received the following reply :—"The memorial is creditable alike to the parishioners and to the vicar whom they desire to retain, but he has already made up his mind after much thought and prayer, and even if I were in a position to ask him to reconsider his decision, I should not think it right to do so. I am firmly convinced that he has decided wisely ; and, further, I have reason to believe that any pressure put upon him to remain would only cause him pain and sorrow. I can well understand your reluctance to part with a vicar whose work among you I estimate as highly as you do yourselves, but I trust that you will look at the matter in the light of the interests of the diocese at large and of the neighbouring parish, and in the spirit of St. Paul's injunction :—"Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.' With most sincere good wishes for the welfare of your friends, and with earnest prayers that a pastor may be sent to you suited to your need and worthy of your love, I remain, dear sirs, your faithful servant for Christ's sake, W. D. Lichfield."

In the *Times* of the 24th inst. Canon Isaac Taylor, writing from Egypt, notices Mr. Bosworth Smith's complaint that he had used his book without acknowledgment or apology. In point of fact Mr. Taylor coupled Mr. Smith's name with those of Carlyle, Deutsch, and Sprenger, as may be seen in the official report of the Church Congress.

ON Wednesday week the Church Missionary Society held a whole-day devotional gathering at

Exeter Hall for solemn supplication, confession, intercession, dedication, and praise in reference to the society's work.

THE Rev. H. B. Vale, vicar of Sproxton, Leicester, asks us to mention that on the occasion of Her Majesty's attending Whippingham Church on Sunday, January 15th, he assisted Canon Prothero, reading the Lessons and the Litany.

THE *Daily Chronicle* states that the Bishop of Rochester having forbidden an organ recital at St. John's, Woolwich, the vicar (the Rev. J. O. Bent) and his churchwardens obtained the use of New Road Presbyterian chapel. It has since been explained that it was proposed to make a charge for admission.

LAST week an interesting discovery was made at Canterbury Cathedral. In 1349 Thomas Bradwardine, commonly called Doctor Profundus, a learned theologian, held the primatial see for a brief period, and it was known that the panelling under the great window of Prior Oxenden, in St. Anselm's Chapel, formed part of the tomb of this Archbishop; but it was not known whether his remains were beneath the stone slab. The tomb has just been opened, under the superintendence of Mr. H. G. Austin, surveyor to the Dean and Chapter, and the skeleton was found, with fragments of cere-cloth, the skull being perfect and some of the bones. The tomb had been rifled of any ornaments it might have contained, such as ring or crosier, and was full of fragments of stained glass.

SOME very alarming statements were made in the evening papers of Monday with reference to the health of the Bishop of Oxford; but we are glad to learn that though his lordship has been confined for two or three weeks to the house, he is now much better, and hopes after some further rest recommended by his doctor to resume his Episcopal duties.

WE regret to learn that the Rev. W. H. Hoare is lying dangerously ill of paralysis at his residence, Oakfield, near Crawley, Sussex.

THE Bishop of Ripon has contradicted the statement that he had been offered and had declined the Bishopric of Wakefield. An impression seems to exist that he has power to select, as Bishop Claughton did, one or other of the two divisions of the diocese, but a special power of choice was given to Bishop Claughton by the Act which created the see of St. Albans.

THE Council of the Incorporated Free and Open Church Association, at its last monthly meeting, resolved to introduce into the House of Commons during the approaching session a Bill entitled "Church Building Facilities Bill," to compel the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to spend (in *bonâ fide* grants of not less than £100) the remainder of the million and a-half of money voted by Parliament in 1818 for building churches, instead of holding it in hand and making small nominal grants to enable them to perpetuate the pew-renting sections of the old Church Building Acts, which but for this practice would long ago have come to an end.

A MEETING of the Rochester Diocesan Church Defence Committee was held at 28, Great George-street, on Monday, Mr. G. B. Richardson in the chair. Various subjects connected with Church matters were chosen by the committee for report to con-

ference, and a grant was made towards meeting the expenses of illustrated lectures on Church history.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Batchelor, Rev. Robert Twiddie, Vicar of Brooke, Norfolk.
 Batson, Rev. A. Wellesley, Mus. Bac. Oxon; Precentor at St. Anne's, Soho.
 Gray, Rev. Frederick Henry, M.A., General Licence for the Diocese of Chichester.
 Humphreys, Rev. A. E., Rector of Fakenham; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.
 Ireland, Rev. Francis, M.A., late Curate of Haigh Parish Church, Wigan; Rector of Ellough, Lowestoft, Suffolk.
 Jackson, Rev. Christopher, B.A., Rector of St. George's, Middleton.
 Jones, Rev. T. Lewis, Curate of St. James's, Upper Bangor; Incumbent of the New Church of Glanadda, near Bangor.
 Le Bert, Rev. G. A., B.A., Curate of St. Cyprian's, Edgehill, Liverpool; Vicar of St. Ambrose's, Farnworth.
 Lee-Warner, Rev. James, Rector of Tarrant Gunville, Dorsetshire; Rector of Beckley, Sussex.
 Lockyear, Rev. Sydney Keeping, Perpetual Curate of Stanley, Derbyshire.
 Longsdon, Rev. H. J., Rector of Keighley and Rural Dean; Rector of Eyam, Derbyshire.
 McDonald, Rev. Walter Percy, M.A., Vicar of Weydon-with-Wangford and Henham, Suffolk.
 Mallett, Rev. G., Chaplain of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, Gloucester.
 Manning, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Leytonstone.
 Matthews, Rev. William Cooke, Vicar of St. George of Colegate Norwich.
 May, Rev. C. E., formerly Curate of Witham; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Halstead.
 Meade, Rev. Charles John, M.A., Vicar of Boughton Monchelsea, near Maidstone.
 Parker, Rev. the Hon. Archibald, M.A., Rector of Broome-with-Oakley, Suffolk.
 Powell, Rev. James Gilbert, Vicar of Linstead Magna and Vicar of Linstead Parva, Suffolk (by dispensation from the Archbishop of Canterbury).
 Rowley, Rev. Joseph Moss, Rector of Ufford, Suffolk; Rural Dean of Wilford.
 Saxton, Rev. Charles Somes, M.A., Rector of Beechamwell St. Mary and St. John and Beechamwell All Saints' with Shingham, Norfolk.
 Teulon, Rev. Josiah Sanders, M.A., Principal of Chichester Theological College; Canon-Residentiary in Chichester Cathedral.
 Worship, Rev. William Henry Edward, B.A., Licensed to Preach within the Diocese of Manchester.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Ford, Rev. Charles Henry, Vicar of Bishopton for nearly thirty years, at Bishopton, Durham, on the 16th inst., aged 64.
 Hayes, Rev. John, M.A., sometime Incumbent of Harpurhey, Manchester, and for twenty-five years Vicar of Colebrookdale, Shropshire, at Allassio, Italy, on the 17th inst., aged 73.
 Hilliard, Rev. Arthur Brewitt, M.A., of Clare College, Cambridge, Vicar of Tettenhall Wood, at the Vicarage, Tettenhall Wood, near Wolverhampton, on the 22nd inst., on his 42nd birthday.
 Holdick, Rev. Thomas Peach, M.A., at Linwood Rectory, Market Rasen, on the 20th inst., in the 84th year of his age.
 Holland, Rev. Henry, Canon, Rector of St. Catherine's, Ont., Canada, at his residence, 288, Spadina-avenue, Toronto, on the 9th inst., aged 69.
 Kelly, Rev. Walter, M.A., Vicar of Preston-cum-Hove from 1834 to 1878, on the 22nd inst., aged 78.
 Seppings, Rev. George W., at Eythorne Rectory, Dover, on the 16th inst., aged 63.
 Thomas, Rev. John, M.A., at Attleborough Vicarage, Nuneaton, on the 16th inst., aged 65.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SINLESSNESS OF THE FLESH.

BY THE REV. CANON SCOTT HOLLAND, D.D.

A SERMON PREACHED AT ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL,
ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 22ND, 1888.

"Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God."
—1 JOHN iv. 2.

JESUS CHRIST came in the flesh." No one who pronounces his faith in those words can ever suppose for a moment that there is anything radically and inherently base in the flesh of human nature. Evidently here is no hint of any alteration in the human character of the flesh to make it fit for God to inhabit. It is our flesh that He became, our nature that He assumed; because the children were flesh and blood, therefore He, too, took up the same, that He might in everything be our brother, our very own. He took it as He found it, as our own history had made it, with all the burden that sin had laid upon it, with all the woe that sin had worked with it, yet without the sin that caused it. Without sin, yet it remained our flesh. This in itself is a disclaimer that sin has any necessary part or lot in the flesh. The Word, indeed, who assumed it restored to it its fulness, its reality of being, and brought it back to its true image. Far from destroying the nature of flesh by taking it, He recreated it into its ordinary and normal character. Flesh became flesh indeed through the Word who entered it; it became all that it was meant to be, its powers were enhanced, its capacities were carried further. It was never as human as when God took it, and therefore never so human, never so fully itself, as when it was made sinless. Far from evil being its true law, its natural inclination, its nominal proclivity, or its richest freedom, the flesh is poisoned by sin, it recovers itself in escaping from the baneful breath of lust into the sweet air of holiness.

This radical goodness of human nature in its essential constitution lies at the root of all our belief in the Incarnation, and the suspicion that so often haunts men's minds lest our flesh should become less itself, and lose something of its humanity by becoming sinless, is a survival in our midst of some antiquated dualism which the Christian faith exploded and overmastered fifteen hundred years ago in the great theology of the fourth century, in the long

struggle to cast out and repel all the various transformations of Platonism and Gnosticism. Once for all the Church declared then that it was with our flesh that Christ became very man, that Christ was made; and that it was obviously impossible if there was any taint of evil in our full manhood as it is after the flesh. But how, then, about the strong language so proverbial in the Epistles of St. Paul, in which the flesh is set violently, antithetically over against the spirit—language which appears certainly to echo all the worst views which the asceticism of the old philosophy put upon the flesh—the flesh which secured to it the very seat of sin, the very nest of passions ugly, foul, and contemptible? Surely St. Paul justifies all this abuse of the flesh when he tells us "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit," "The carnal mind is at enmity with God," and that "They that are in the flesh cannot please God."

Now, in estimating this language, we can start with the previous certainty that it is quite possible that St. Paul should be meaning the same thing as those ascetics who held that flesh contained in its very nature an evil principle radically antagonistic to the good. Against that, most undoubtedly, he had believed from his childhood, and accepted to the very last hour of his life the first chapter of Genesis, which declares the absolute goodness of the entire creation in its original construction—animal as well as human, bodily as well as spiritual. Upon all that was created went out the approving benediction of God—"God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good." That was St. Paul's creed, you may be sure, and this denied emphatically the natural wickedness of the flesh, the dualism of the philosophers, and on the top of this first faith St. Paul, without a fragment of hesitation, added his belief in the Incarnation to justify, approve, sanctify the flesh out of love for it, to make it the wonder of angels, the consummation of humanity, knitting all the human fragments up into unity of Christ's body. This he held with his whole soul, and, so holding, it was absolutely inconceivable that he should have believed the flesh to be radically anything but good. What, then, did he mean? For certainly, for some reason or other, out of some accident, or event, or process, the flesh had, according to him, become the focus, the scene, the theatre, the symbol, the expression, the fortress, the evidence of all that was bad, base, and godless.

How did that come about? St. Paul himself tells us. He sketches the story by which this character had accrued to the flesh, and he shows with positive clearness that he traced the spring and origin of sin not to the flesh, but to the spirit and will of man. Let us just follow St. Paul's summary of the story. It is given in the 1st chapter of Romans.

How did man's unrighteousness begin? "When they knew God they glorified him not as God."

The starting-point of sin is not to be found below, beneath; not to be found at all by St. Paul in some dark swarm of animal passions that go climbing up in hideous invasion to the pure heights where the spirit looks out with eyes that search for God. On the contrary, the starting-point is at the very height, the topmost point of man's highest spiritual thoughts, in which he is at his furthest removed from the animal, where God, the Eternal, displays Himself to man's contemplation through the beauty and order of man's creation. It is here, at this point, that man first fails. The vision was clear enough. The invisible things of God—His eternal power and divinity—were clearly to be seen and understood by the things that are seen. The faculty to know, and the evidence for knowledge, the power to exercise the faculties of saying "There is a vision of God," was morally bound to kindle the highest spiritual joy, and such a joy would inevitably break out in praise, in thanks, in adoration. But it was here men held off, men checked themselves. The outflowing current was obstructed and blocked—they saw, but they would not rejoice in what they saw; they saw, and to see was to love, but they stopped at love. The spirit in them that should go out in glorious greetings of a Father who made all things good and doeth all things well—that spirit perverted itself. "When they knew God they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful!" So came the rift in the lute. Alas for the splendour of that early music of God's dawn, when "the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy!" It was with those glad angels that man was called to lift up his voice, at the feet of those who for ever were crying, "Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth on the throne, for He has made all things, and for Him all things were created." Man held aloof from that sweet singing. That was his sin. "When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful." And the sin could not stop there. First, the negative—they refuse God the praise; then the positive—the organs that were not exercised in thanksgiving fell into the mischief of idleness, they became vain in their imaginations. The imagination, the reasonings, the intellectual keenness, the disputes, the dialectical brain, which should, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, have searched the deep things of God, goes off at a tangent, takes wrong roads, becomes entangled in clever sophistries; it loses its radical veracity, it spends its efforts on vacancy, it has become hollow, empty, and vain. "They became vain in their imaginations, and then their foolish heart was darkened." The heart, the very faculty of thought, lost its capacity to think; it became spoiled, damaged, corrupt; because they have failed to love and rejoice in what they saw, therefore, they failed to see. A cloud spreads itself. There is no longer the clear-sightedness. The foolish

heart of them is darkened. Instead of being wise they became fools. The will which withheld love is stultified, the intellect which cannot love is landed in absurdities. We cannot reason aright without loving. A man without love is a stupid man; he is like an owl in the twilight; and so man through lack of love to God, lost his love of God; he became a fool. And so the evil descends to a lower stage. The folly of the heart shows itself positively first in the form of idolatry. The lack of true knowledge about God issues in positive wrong-doing; the lack of adoration issues in false praise and adoration. The stupid mind made man mistake the creature for the Creator; the darkened heart cannot hold fast the distinctions; all is blurred, blotted, and confused. Man cannot discern between God and Nature. Nature the created, the visible, looms up before his clouded eyes in immense and gathering grandeur; it occupies his whole vision, and he loses sight of its limits and its horizon. The glory that should be God's own implicates itself with the things on which it is shed; it seems to man's blinded eyes to be their own, and he gives to them the awe, the fear, the praise, which God, through them, is rousing in him. That was his mistake. God's voice speaks to him through the thunder, as the Psalms tell us, and then man deems that it is the thunder that speaks; and God's splendour glows through the sunlight, and man bows low before the sun. God's versatility, beauty, and utility pours itself out over bird and beast and creeping thing, and man makes the beast his god and worships the creeping thing. The stupidity of the darkened heart and the vain imagination of man changed the truth of God into a lie, and he worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator. The Creator indeed cannot be dragged down by such infamous confusion, but sits on high, pure and true. Yea, says St. Paul, "God is over all blessed for ever."

And now comes the last stage. It is at the end, not at the beginning that we find that sin sinks to the lowest layers—sinks down to that in man which we associate so intimately with evil, the flesh, the appetites, the passions. It comes about as the issue of that stupid idolatry which was due to the darkening of the intellect which again followed on the perversion of spiritual love. All this intellectual chaos, this distorted imagination, this misguided will, this erring, wayward, silly sophistry, all this spiritual rebellion against God, drops down to reappear in the flesh as a tumult, a mob of disordered appetites. The disturbance above creates as its natural result the disturbance below. All the sweet seemliness of harmonious man, disappears, and there are now revolt, violence, extravagance, blindness, distraction. The fabric of social affections is shattered. We no longer knit men together in enduring bonds; they wander loose and distracted, working mischief and hate;

the flesh seethes in a wild ferment of corrupt appetites. It is the normal and inevitable effect, and that effect God sanctions. It fulfils God's own laws, the laws by which man was created. "God gave them over, therefore, to uncleanness, through the lust of their own flesh." It could not but happen, and God approved that it should happen. "Because they changed the truth of God into a lie, God gave them over unto vile affections." He suffered the natural result to follow unhindered by Him. "Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to do those things which are not convenient," and so the works of the flesh reveal themselves in their full force in their fatal savagery. Men became "filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, without understanding, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." This is St. Paul's account of the origin of the sin of the flesh, and Christian doctrine has never for a moment wavered in its loyalty to that description. Always it has protested with vigour against the Manichæism which made evil to be a quality, a natural attribute of a lower and fleshly nature in man. Always it has declared that there is no such thing known to it as an evil nature; there is nothing existent whose true property it is to be evil. All that which is in the highest sense natural must be good, for God created nature. Christianity has only one account to give of sin, and that is that it is a perversion of good, a distortion of nature, an unnatural corruption.

"But the natural man is at enmity with God." Do not let that expression confuse us for a moment. The natural man is sinful because man's nature is supernatural. It is unnatural, it is against the very law of his nature, for him to be merely natural. If man drops to the lower level, to the level of that which he has in common with other creatures, if he confines himself to the limited horizons of the animal, if he hugs the natural, and refuses to look beyond and rise above it, then he sins not only against his higher self—his mind, imagination, will—but against his lower self—he sins against his nature and against his flesh. His body was made so as to receive its transfiguration through the light that should stream down into it out of that illuminated world with which his intellect, mind, and will were to bring him into contact. His nature was ready to respond to the replenishing, and now it has missed its aim, it has lost its development; it is the flesh which feels the damage and realises the loss, and all the consequent turmoil and trouble is but the cry of the spirit, which by professing to be natural has ruined its nature, by sinking to the lower level of the flesh has irretrievably thwarted the capacities of the flesh itself. Man, by becoming natural, sins against his nature, and it is the higher and not the lower elements in man that are

guilty of that sinful lapse. No, our position is not confused, it is rather emphasized by the phrase which makes "the natural man" the expression of disgrace and degradation.

Christian theology has but one source whence sin can spring—an evil will; and that is a spiritual source, and this evil can never be a natural quality, but always a distorted good, for that will which makes sin exist was certainly so created as to adore God.

And now we can see easily enough why, when once the sin has taken place, "the flesh," "the natural man," become the normal expressions by which the sinful conditions so produced may be best described. Man's sin, as we have said, is that he, through disloyalty of spiritual desire, has become merely "fleshly" and "natural." He has become now carnal. The flesh, in its disorganisation, demoralisation, corruption, makes permanent the horrible lapse of faith, and not only are its functions all thrown into tumult and disorder, but, worse, the flesh has now admitted within its own circle those finer powers which were intended for higher and vaster occupations. They have deserted their watch-towers where they were put, and now they are discharging their magnificent charges into the narrow channels laid open by the flesh. The imagination, which ought to be reviewing the beauty of God and His harmonious work, is now lending its hideous aid to the passions. As it kindles the blood by its swift fancies and eager curiosities, it feeds the passions with conceits, prompts them with pictures, maddens them with poisonous art; and the intellect which ought to be unravelling and revealing the whole counsel of God is now giving assistance to the appetites, ever going further afield, catering with its audacious skill for the desire which it has kindled. It has never failed in contriving new sensible delights; and hither and thither making use both of imagination and intellect,—it pushes and presses the rebel will. The will has forgotten its great office of gathering up the entire man into a single willing offering, a single Eucharist. It is now bent on self-gratification through the pleasures, through the senses, through the feelings. Those feelings, those senses that were meant to move in sweet obedience to man's upward spiritual growth, are now impregnated with all the heat and fever of the will; it inserts itself within them, and works there like leaven, and seeks its own fulfilment, and pushes them forward into more and more extravagant claims. Whatever of possible satisfaction the imagination can picture or the intellect describe over the wide surface of the earth, that the will of the man spreads itself to reach and have. Here is, indeed, the carnal mind that is at enmity with God—the mind that has for its field, and object, and matter, the needs of the flesh, and we men dare to call those passions "animal," as if any animal possessed at all those extravagant desires or exhibited this tumult of ex-

cess. It is because the passions are ours and human that they become endowed with this fearful exuberance. So, now out of the flesh which they have demoralised, proceed all those works of the flesh,—adultery, fornication, lasciviousness, uncleanness, idolatry, and this just because an unnatural and monstrous strength has been lent to the passions that they never can attain the satisfaction which they seek, and they loathe their very life, and they hate the world which so deceives them, and become therefore ever more full of cruelty and malice and malignity, and so all those other works of the flesh proceed—hatred, emulations, strife, seditions, envies, murders, drunkenness, and such like. We accuse the flesh because it is in the flesh that sin displays to us its final and inevitable and unavoidable results. The flesh is the scene in which sin makes itself evident, and asserts the dominion it has won. The sin is always in the will, in the secret, inward man. There it is that we commit rebellion and turn perverse, and no doubt this inner sin seems to us but a slight and transitory lapse, an idle and indifferent slip into falsehood; we were very sorry, and we hastily resolved to avoid so falling again, and then we forget it; it was but a little thing, and it is done and over now, and we have regretted it, and all is right; nothing remains; it is hidden up there in the secret man; surely it is gone, passed by, and forgotten. Very lightly we treat it, very easily we fancy it will pass away. It may have gone, but it has left a disorder behind it, and the flesh, the lower man, bears traces of that disorder. Into it the deposit of sin has been thrown; down into the germ works its poison; that flying curiosity has set moving the swarm of appetites; that malice has aroused the passions that made for hate, and at some hour, when we are not expectant or aware, it breaks out all over us like a disease, and we shrink back and protest, and we did not believe we were capable of such wicked thoughts, and we say it is not so—we are purer, better, holier than this; it is our animal passions that insult and defile us. Let us at least be honest with ourselves. This error of ours, which is our ruin if we pride ourselves on it or content ourselves with it, may itself be our salvation if we recognise in it and by it our own inner guilt which we, in invisible stealth, did so that it escaped our judgment, but which now, in and through the visible evidence of the sin, discloses even to our eyes its deformity, its vileness, its permanence, its seriousness and peril, and so we may learn how real and definite must be the pains that we take to undo and remove the effects of sin.

In conclusion, one short word of warning. We see the danger of an evil of which we often think lightly in the disuse and indolence of our spiritual faculties. The terrible power which is given to the passions comes through the failure to keep in exercise the higher faculties—imagination, intellect, and

will—on their true object, the vision and glory of God. Through that failure these powers grow confused and disordered: they seek fulfilment in false ways! they turn their attention upon the flesh; they pour their abundance into those channels, as they feel pushing and alive within them the full force of deteriorated intellect, of a perverted imagination, of a prostituted will. These that should be priests of the manhood that is in us, lifting on high, with warning hands, all that is in us to sanctify, are demoralised even as priests that have been unfrocked and degraded—they cast loose all shame, lose all scruple; and all this may come about through leaving all these high gifts unused. Believe me, it is not with impunity that they are left idle. Intellect, imagination, will—these must find food, occupation, service, somehow, somewhere; and if we do nothing for their right employment they will find it for themselves elsewhere, they will animate the flesh until it has power, like the wild beast, to turn and devour us. Then it will be too late to repent. God grant us now betimes to cut off the evil growth, to cut off the supplies, to train and exercise these faculties in their proper office to joy in God. That is our chance, and then it is that we are enabled to do work in the name of Him who for our sakes took flesh and, in his great pity for us, dwelt among us.

“FORGETTING THE PAST.”

BY THE REV. G. JANNINGS, M.A., RECTOR.

A NEW YEAR'S SERMON, PREACHED IN WARMSWORTH CHURCH, JANUARY 1ST, 1888.

“Forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before.”—PHIL. iii. 10.

WE can hardly take leave of an old year and begin a new one, as we do this day, without having some thoughts, more or less deep and serious, about the rapid flight of time, without feeling sensible of a loss, and that we have spent so much of what must necessarily be a limited store, and which, for aught we know, may be well-nigh exhausted. Upon those who have reached—or nearly so—the limit commonly allotted to human life, the deduction of another year from their term of days calls with a loud and solemn voice to consider their latter end. And unless they be among the number of the old and foolish, who seem to strive, as it were, to fight off old age and death to the very last, the passing by of another year will naturally suggest thoughts of a serious and edifying kind.

There is not a more delightful phase of human character than that of a cheerful as well as a pious old age, able to take a lively interest in the pursuits and pleasures of the young, and yet not hiding

from itself the inevitably near approach of death ; looking back upon the past without regret, and forward to the future without fear—calm and strong in the confidence of a lively faith in Christ, and of a well-grounded hope in God's mercy through him ; whilst, on the other hand, there cannot be a sadder spectacle than that of an old man or an old woman insensible of the awful issues of life—frivolous and vain—up to the very edge of eternity. May we all learn betimes the happy art of so using the world as not to abuse it, that, having attained the great end of life, we may depart, whenever our time comes, in the spirit of Him who said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." But unless we are among the utterly thoughtless we shall all—both young and old—have had some serious thoughts as we entered upon another year. In many cases, doubtless, these thoughts have imparted an additional seriousness and fervour to our prayers. We have thought with some degree of thankfulness upon the many mercies, and with some degree of sorrow of the many sins and shortcomings of the past. This is so far good, but yet we shall, most of us, perhaps, be willing to confess that even these sober new-year thoughts have too often proved far too vague and fugitive to create any deep impression upon the mind, that they have seldom led to any high resolves—to real newness of life—that, after the year has fairly set in, we have soon forgotten our good intentions. Let us try, therefore, now to collect into a focus the scattered rays of thought which, as we pass from an old year to a new one, almost involuntarily shoot through the mind, and let us turn them with a steady gaze upon ourselves, our condition and prospects, if by any means our attention may be drawn more intently to the great end and purpose of life, if so be, that these great landmarks on the sands of time may serve to impress us with a sense of its value and of the importance of using it aright.

There is certainly no natural distinction beyond those of the seasons and the changes of day and night to mark the flight of time ; there is no special signal to sound the knell of the expiring year—the stream of time glides as quietly and as rapidly onward at the end of an old year as at the close of each day ; every moment as it flies is, in fact, the "conflux of two eternities," behind it is an infinite past, and before it an eternal future ; but just as in a journey by road—the milestones by the road-side, although they neither hasten nor retard our course, yet serve to indicate our progress and remind us that so much of the journey is accomplished—so do the years as we date them from the first coming of Christ, denote our progress in the journey of life, and call upon us "so to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. The words of the apostle in the text we may well adopt as our New Year's motto

and resolution, "Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before." We should not indeed forget the mercies of the past, these it is our duty, and it should be our pleasure also, at a time like this, to remember with gratitude. Unless we gratefully call to mind the mercies of God, and trace the course (often so mysterious yet always so wise and merciful) of his Providence over us, we easily forget His goodness and ascribe all our prosperity and success to our own merit or to mere good fortune.

Or if our lot has been one of disappointment and failure, through not recognising God's hand in our trials, we lose all the fruit and blessing of adversity.

Let us not then forget, as we look back upon the past, the mercy which has so long watched over us and preserved us ; let us not fail to thank God for that goodness which has permitted us to see the beginning of another year.

Nor must we regard the Apostle as meaning that we should forget altogether the sins and shortcomings of the past. We must know what our faults are, and where our weak points lie, in order that we may amend our lives. We cannot very well make a fresh start, and turn over a new leaf in life, unless we are aware of our own deficiencies ; but a very short examination will suffice, if we ought not to forget our sins, neither is it well to brood over them ; we may soon know where we need amendment. Conscience, if we question her, will soon tell us which way the battle is going—whether, on the whole, it is in favour of good or evil—whether or no there be any struggle at all, or a listless yielding of ourselves to all the impulses and inclinations of the natural man ; whether we are being gradually drawn more into the vortex of earthly desires and feelings, or whether we are making head against the stream. We have probably forgotten the greater part of our separate acts of sin, but we may gather what our past life has been from what we are now, for we are what the past has made us. If we had lived otherwise we should have been otherwise ; if we had lived more prayerful, watchful, obedient lives, we should have been more holy now. What an awful significance and importance does this consideration give to our common every-day life. Our thoughts and actions from our youth up, have left their mark—of how many of these thoughts and actions, must we not say, have left their scar and stain upon us. Each thought, much more each act of the past, has done its part in the formation of our present character. In proportion, therefore, as we know ourselves truly, in proportion as we know what we are now, we may know what our past lives have been.

It is not necessary for the purpose of self-examination that we should remember everything that we have done or thought of evil in time past.

There may be too much self-evolution and self-inspection. To brood over our sins and go over them again in thought will do no good. It may do quite as much to pollute us as to humble us. There is such a thing as a morbid and diseased self-consciousness. As those who dabble in medical science are apt to fancy that they have the symptoms of the diseases of which they read in books, so it is possible to have morbid fancies about ourselves in religion. It is possible to probe and analyze over much. The more common fault is certainly on the other side, but we may possibly err, nevertheless, on the side of an unhealthy self-contemplation. It is a good thing to have the memory as well as the guilt of past sin blotted out.

It is well, in this sense at any rate, to forget those things which are behind, and rather to reach forth unto those things which are before,—to look upward and onward, out of ourselves and our own littleness and vileness, and to look unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith—the perfect pattern of human excellence—look away from the world and all that would allure and enchant us here, and fix our eyes upon the prize of our high calling. Let us signalize this new year by a new life; forget the past, and not conclude that the rest of our time must needs be like the former, and that there is nothing new under the sun.

Let those among us who have hitherto been living without any serious aim or purpose, or alas! with the sole aim of pleasing self at all costs—at the cost even of sinning wilfully—of sacrificing, it may be, health and reputation, God's favour and their own peace, upon the shrine of some cruel idol—of some craving appetite, for instance, to which the more its victim yields, the more does it cry Give, give, and can never be satisfied. Let those, I say, who are thus living a purposeless or a wicked life turn over a new leaf. Think not that it is now too late to mend; forget the things that are behind; brood not over the past, and think that a course of life which has been pursued so long must needs be continued to the end. Think not that habits so long persisted in cannot be broken—think not that sins so obstinate and aggravated can never be forgiven. "Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God for he will abundantly pardon."

But the special and more immediate lesson of this text is for those who have already made a start in the Christian race. Their danger is that of self-complacency—of resting satisfied with what they have already done—with what they have already attained. They have experienced a great change in sentiment and feeling at some particular crisis of their lives, and so far from forgetting the things that are behind, many such look back upon the beginning of their spiritual life as the

all-important sign of acceptance. They have once been converted, and that is enough.

So did not the Great Apostle of the Gentiles; His conversion was sudden and even miraculous, but we never find him presuming upon it or accounting himself for that reason secure of salvation. He speaks rather of himself as fighting vigorously against the corrupt desires of the natural man, lest after having preached to others, he himself should be a castaway. His labours were more abundant than those of his brother apostles, but he never seems to think that he has done enough. He is never self-satisfied. Like a runner in a race, bent on winning the prize, he forgets the things that are behind, looks not back upon the part of the course which he has already traversed, but onward towards the goal.

And so it should be with all who, like the Great Apostle, desire to obtain the prize of their high calling.

It should not content us to have once tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come. We must not think that all we have to do with Jesus is to take him as our Saviour, and to rejoice in his great salvation. There is work for us to do for him. We are not simply to seek our own safety and to rest satisfied with having laid hold of the hope that is set before us in the Gospel. It should be the aim of those who have realized the greatness of the obligation under which they stand to Christ, to glorify Him who hath called them "out of darkness into His marvellous light," glorify Him by more entire self-surrender—by greater efforts to do Him service by trying to lead more consistent and obedient lives, and by trying to bring others to the knowledge of the truth.

We must not dream that because it has been given us to see that our sins were laid on Jesus we may cease from our watching and our warfare; we must not count ourselves to have apprehended, as the apostle says, but ever "follow after, if that we may apprehend that for which also we are apprehended of Christ Jesus."

There are those again whose spiritual history has no marked features; they have neither sinned grossly nor been the subjects of any deep religious convictions. They have renounced the follies of youth, and settled down as quiet and useful members of society; but they do not concern themselves very much about the absence of any signs of progress in their spiritual life and character. So far as they can see they are much the same as they were some years ago. If they have not altered for the better neither are they, as they think, much the worse. They approve what is excellent; they are not altogether neglectful of the duties of religion, but there is just one thing which they are not doing—they are not reaching forth unto those things which are before—not pressing towards the mark for the prize of their high calling; not

systematically trying to be more religious, not paying more strict attention than they used to do to prayer, not taking heed to keep all the ordinances of God's appointment, not searching to find out what neglected duties might be performed, what duties which are only half performed might be discharged with more zeal and sincerity, and they are thus almost at a standstill in religion, so far as that is possible, scarcely growing in grace if not absolutely falling back, because they have been trusting to time when they should have been trusting in God, because they have taken it for granted that in some way or other, at some time or other, they would surely become prepared for their latter end.

But is this a matter which may safely be left in this uncertainty? The very day on which we are met together preaches to us on the shortness and transitoriness of human life. We have been permitted by the mercy of God to see the first day of a new year; whether we shall see its last none can tell. And let us remember that the stream of time, if we have not Christ with us in the ship, will only drift us further away from heaven each year we live.

Time is sometimes called the great healer, and it may indeed do something to heal the sorrows of life, but it never can heal the wounds of sin. It can only dull and blunt the conscience and make it insensible to danger, just as the cold can benumb the traveller when lost in the mountain snows.

It is only Christ who can heal and not stupefy—heal the sores of a wounded conscience as well as the sorrows of the broken heart.

Let us then trust no more to the healing influence of months and years, but if we have not yet done so, let us arise and go to our Father and seek of him for Christ's sake pardon for what is past, and a new heart and a right spirit that we may serve Him henceforth out of love.

And let it be the New Year's resolution of us all to "forget the things that are behind, and to reach forth unto those things which are before;" let us not dwell, that is, with complacency on anything that we have experienced or attained, but press onwards towards the mark, like the runner in a race, and "so let us run that we may obtain."

ON Friday, Archdeacon Blunt conducted a Quiet Day at Holy Trinity Church, Hull. The services were largely attended by the clergy in the town and neighbourhood.

THE preachers in the Chapel Royal, Savoy, for the present month are as follows:—Mornings, the Rev. Henry White. Evenings—5th, the Rev. J. Graves, chaplain of the Chapel Royal, Kensington Palace; 12th, the Rev. P. T. Bainbridge, vicar of St. Thomas's, Regent Street; 19th, the Rev. W. P. Pearce, preacher at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields; 26th, the Rev. W. Covington, vicar of Holy Trinity, Brompton.



NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT OFFICE, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 6d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1888.

WELSH NONCONFORMITY AND THE CHURCH.

THE bitter hostility towards the Church which is displayed by many of the Protestant Nonconformists in Wales calls for careful investigation. It certainly cannot be ascribed to the principles inherited from former generations of Nonconformists. The fathers of Nonconformity in Wales, although they lived at a time when the Church was far less active than at the present day, consistently deprecated any attempt to attack her. Howell Harris, Daniel Rowlands, and William Williams proclaimed their attachment to her doctrines. The rules adopted by the Welsh Methodists in 1801 declare that they did not "designedly dissent" from the Church. "In doctrine," they state, "we exactly agree with the Articles of the Church of England, and preach no other doctrines but what are contained and fully and clearly expressed in them. We highly approve of her excellent and most evangelical Liturgy. . . . Making a sect, or forming a party, is not the object we are aiming at. God forbid!" Anyone who will compare with such statements as these the violent attacks upon the Church which are now made by the vernacular Press, a Press which is mainly in the hands of Dissenting ministers, will see at once the change which has taken place. Their tone is illustrated by the following extract from the *Celt* (December 23rd, 1887):—"Disestablishment and Disendowment is coming, when the Church of England will be put to his or her own resources, and they, the parsons, will have to work or starve. They have enjoyed the fat of this land for ages, but the wheel has well nigh completed its revolutions. There is 'an angel standing in the sun' (Rev. xix. 17), and that angel is William Ewart

Gladstone, and he has begun to cry out with a loud voice to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, 'Come to the supper of the great God,' and the end will be that all the fowls will have their fill of their flesh by the wealth of the State Church being used for national purposes." This extraordinary change in the attitude of the Nonconformists cannot be accounted for by any deterioration in the work of the Church, for by the admission of the Liberationist leaders a great spiritual revival has passed over the Church in Wales in recent years. But if the cause of their hostility can be found neither in theological differences with the Church, since when she was at her worst the Dissenters refused to attack her, nor in her shortcomings in the present, since they admit that she is now at her best, only one reason remains. They wish to disestablish the Church, and to strip her of her endowments, because her ministers have been guilty of what Mr. Stuart Rendel, who has lately constituted himself the champion of Welsh Nonconformity, calls, "proselytism." This was the grievance urged in more forcible language at the recent meeting of the Welsh National League, by the Rev. Job Mills, an independent Minister at Aberystwith. "The Welsh Nation," he said, "is not going to stand any more nonsense. The conduct of the Church party has become perfectly intolerable. We have just received a fresh supply of clergy at Aberystwith, and the curates are going about visiting every house, and making proselytes! It is a dirty work—(laughter). It is dirty, too—(hear). In fact, it is filthy, nasty, dirty work—(applause). They are incessantly going about trying to win our people, and we are not going to stand it any longer."

Attention has been drawn to the religious statistics of Wales. Everything points the same moral—that the Church is advancing, while the sects are losing ground. Mr. Edwards, the Vicar of Carmarthen, has collected a large number of facts—(letters to the *Times*, dated November 1st and November 10th, 1887)—from the official publications of the dissenting bodies. He shows that since 1884 the number of communicants annually admitted by the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists has decreased by 4,254, and that in 1886 there was a decrease of 892 in the total number of hearers. The Wesleys numbered 22,270 members in 1884, 22,179 in 1885, and 22,087 in 1886. The members of Baptist Congregations show but a very slight increase in the same period, from 72,711 in 1884, to 73,156 in 1886, and they have decreased since 1883. The Congregationalists report that the numbers of both their members and their hearers have remained stationary since 1884. These facts place it beyond doubt that Welsh Dissent, far from keeping pace with the increase of population, is falling below the standard of its past achievements. At the same

time the chapels are groaning under the burden of an enormous debt. The chapel debt of the Calvinistic Methodists, the largest of the sects, stood at £246,926 in 1878, at £311,294 in 1881, and at £323,118 in 1886, while the sum devoted to its repayment fell from £43,508 in 1878 to £31,440 in 1886. In the Rhondda Valley alone the debt on Nonconformist places of worship in the aggregate is said to amount to £500,000. But the most crushing exposure of the decay of Nonconformity in Wales has been supplied by Mr. Gee, the proprietor of the *Baner* newspaper, and the most inveterate opponent of the Church.

In order to establish the numerical weakness of Churchmen, he arranged for his famous census of attendances at all the places of worship in the Principality on January 9th, 1887. He was frank enough to give notice to Churchmen of his intentions, but he advised the Dissenters to be present in full force in their Chapels. "Let neither man, woman, nor suckling," he said, "be found absent. Let neither man-servant nor maid-servant cross the threshold of the Church on that Sunday." But no sooner was the census taken than the Liberationists protested against the publication of the results. The Calvinistic Methodists at Dolgelly forthwith passed a resolution declaring that it was "unreliable," and the *Cambrian News* in its next issue announced that "no greater blunder was ever made," and that "the Church has scored in a way that will tell against Nonconformity for many a year to come, unless the whole thing is at once repudiated on the ground of its worthlessness." The *Goleuad* said that if Mr. Gee were "the greatest enemy of Nonconformity that Wales ever produced, he could not betray Nonconformity more thoroughly and disgracefully." He could only be regarded as "one who has committed the greatest possible crime—a crime that has placed us in the hands of our enemies, and one that will put back for many weary years the accomplishment of the object which was about coming to pass." To this day the figures have never been published, and Churchmen are justified in maintaining that the Dissenters are afraid to reveal their own weakness. The subject was taken up by the *North Wales Chronicle*, which published returns from twenty-nine parishes, according to which Churchmen numbered 29,958, the Calvinistic Methodists 18,167, and members of all denominations 26,326. The parishes dealt with include agricultural, mining, and other industrial neighbourhoods, and the proportion shown by the returns of two Churchmen to three Nonconformists of all denominations, is far removed from the depreciatory estimates of Church membership supplied by the Liberationists.

While signs of the decadence of Dissent in Wales multiply from month to month, and from week to week, there is abundant proof of the growing strength of the Church. Already, as may be seen from the *Official Year Book*, nearly one-

third of the population is baptised in church, three-eighths of the children are educated in Church schools, and there is a steady increase in the number of candidates presented for confirmation. The outlook for the Church is by no means so gloomy as her enemies hope and many of her friends fear. If the attack can be repelled for a few more years the Church will, at her present rate of progress, be secure. Few politicians will maintain that the Church should be disestablished at a time when she is taking a firmer hold of the affections of the people, and when rival denominations are proving their incapacity to fill her place. Parliament does not readily consent to overthrow an institution which is faithfully performing its proper duties, yet this is the course which it is invited to adopt in regard to the Church in Wales. The Church is to be disestablished, not because the clergy are neglecting their work, but because they are doing it too well to please the Dissenting Ministers. It would be a waste of time to dwell upon the unfairness of such an indictment. As soon as it is understood that the attack upon the Church has sectarian jealousy for its motive, the Liberationists' agitation will excite the contempt and derision of all honest men.

G. O. B.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

BEWARE OF *ODIUM THEOLOGICUM*.

SIR,—Allow me to offer you my best thanks for giving insertion in your impartial publication to the gentlemanly letter of "Medicus." He is perfectly right in remonstrating against the request made to you to boycott Charles Crosthwaite. This reverend gentleman is already not only boycotted by the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, but also subjected to unseemly censures in the very print which was so long only too proud of the gratuitous aid of his able pen, yet now abuses him in terms too grievous for me to copy, and this without admitting his replies in defence or explanation. As to the merits of the particular question raised concerning the *Quicunque vult* in the Irish Synod, I can say, as a member of that body, who voted and spoke against the modes of dealing with that most important document there proposed, that I am as certain as I can be of anything that ever took place before my eyes, that the Broad-Church members of that assembly voted over and over again, passing into the division lobby of the "ayes," mixed up with the Low Church members, both being engaged (whether with or without previous concert I care not), in a common purpose, namely, to mutilate this symbolical test, or else, with many other hostile modifications to expel it from the Book of Common Prayer. Any one who likes disputing may dispute over what all this ought to be called; but that all this took place it is ridiculous to deny. Also I well remember how that the well-meaning and worthy Lord Ebury (the head of the English extreme Low Church

revisionists), was brought over as a guest of some one, and given a place on the platform as a visitor, apparently to further this hostile purpose in an indirect way. And so things went on until people opened their eyes (to which remonstrances, addressed to the representative body in respect of duty, largely contributed) and there was a meeting held at Morrison's Hotel to resist this movement. I was not present at this, but was at a meeting held at the Palace, St. Stephen's Green, under Archbishop Trench, when matters came to a crisis through the resistance of Low Church members (*e.g.*, Rev. Mr. Hewitt in particular, whom I name with respect, and others, who openly disavowed themselves from this movement or design, at least they strongly protested against it then and there. And a practical compromise was the final result. Now, where is the guilt, what the sin of Canon Crosthwaite in fairly giving so much of this fight as suited his legitimate purpose, and then in candidly explaining his meaning, without retracting his main contention, wherever he could get an opening for so doing?

Parties who ask why Canon Crosthwaite is not sent to the Synod, either know not or affect not to know that he is an Octogenarian, who, however mentally and morally well-qualified, is physically disabled from even seeking such a position.

I sincerely trust that the brilliant, telling efforts of his able pen may long find a welcome place in your honest paper. And I feel sure that your most enlightened readers will peruse his contributions with the same relish as aforesaid. Above all I am perfectly confident that the method proposed of reducing to silence and covering with disgrace an able and honest man, nobly fighting the battle of his Church and country, will never find an echo in your honest English heart.

PHILIP DWYER.

SIR,—I am sure all sensible men will agree with what "Medicus" says in your last as to how gentlemen should treat each other. I have no wish to prolong this discussion on Revision here—enough has been said. But one or two matters I should like to notice briefly.

(1.) Your readers who see the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, will be struck with the courteous and fair (!) way in which (in a leader of January 28th), the editor prints a number of letters *against* "Even-handed Justice," but *not one* on the other side! The whole composition is, however, in bad taste, and it is easily seen that it is written to gratify some personal animosity—one good thing may come of it! It is a good advertisement (inserted gratis!) of your fair and excellent paper, and will be the means I hope of adding to the number of your subscribers!

(2.) We Irish evangelicals are greatly tickled at the sudden conversion of your contemporary. Last February we were spoken of with contempt as a "Revision Faction" (February 19th, 1887), who were going to turn "our beloved Church" into a "mere sect" "cut off from the whole Anglican communion"! But last week, January 28th, we are alluded to in the most complimentary terms! we (Revisionists) "were in earnest," we "voted strictly according to our consciences," we "fought our principles out bravely," etc. etc.

(3.) A certain correspondent was accused once of "making fun of the revised Prayer Book," yet they

do this very thing themselves, for in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* for January 14th they ridicule him for standing up for the Black Rubric, which is spoken of most slightly. Yes, they *hate* this grand Rubric! it is the "fly" in our Anglican "ointment" that corrupts the whole! it is the "Jonah" these disloyal ones would fain throw overboard; and they make no secret of it.

(4.) Lastly! Your Irish contemporary boasts of opening his columns to all, etc., yet I see he speaks of a certain church paper (January 14th, page 41), as being supported mainly by members of the Protestant Defence Association, and its correspondents are mainly "our disappointed contributors." This is a most damaging confession? You, sir, are fair to all; you "boycott" none who honestly state their opinions; nor do you stoop to low personal abuse or vituperation. I hope that many more may subscribe to your excellent paper during this year.

AN IRISH EVANGELICAL AND REVISIONIST.

January 29th, 1888.

ST. JOHN VI. 58.

"This is that bread which came down from heaven."

What is this bread, which our Lord says, came down from heaven?

SIR,—Would any of your readers kindly throw some light on this statement. Can it refer to the words, "and the bread that I will give is My flesh which I will give for the life of the world"? Clearly not, because that flesh, given, was His body, His natural body, which from childhood "increased in stature," and which same body suffered on the Cross and died. Surely that body, in no sense, can have come down from heaven. Again, it cannot refer to our Lord's natural body, although He says, "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath everlasting life," because immediately afterwards He says, "the flesh profiteth nothing," to prove the same thing to the Jews. What then is this bread that came down from heaven? We saw above that it could not refer to our Lord's natural body, "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, and which suffered on the Cross"; and with His own words quoted also, how could it possibly refer to His flesh and blood? May it refer to that, which coming with the bread, makes life and gives life, "the Spirit that quickeneth," while the flesh profits nothing; and which spirit, or grace, He calls bread; and which bread He calls elsewhere "His Body," as He calls the wine "His Blood"? But will this explain the words, "which came down from heaven"? As I am seeking for knowledge, not offering it, I must wait for the light which others perhaps can give.

INQUIRENS.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCHES.

SIR,—The Rev. Brownlow Maitland's article in the PULPIT of the 21st, is altogether right in its attempt to define the word CHURCH, and yet it is in some degree misleading.

The use of the expressions "visible Church" and "invisible or mystical Church" implies, and almost compels readers to think, that to use the language

of technical logic, "Church" is a genus, whereof "visible" and "invisible" are species. This is not so. The visible Church is related to the mystical Church, not as a different kind of a Church, but as the symbol to the reality, or as a picture to the thing represented. All will probably assent to this, but nevertheless it may be a help to clear thought thus to state it expressly.

This may be illustrated by the fact—for I think it is a fact—that clear ideas in an important branch of physical science have been made needlessly difficult by the use of the expression *radiant heat*, seeming to imply that radiant heat is a species of heat. It is not so; but a distinct form of force, as distinct from heat as either from electricity; and it would be better to discontinue the expression, and substitute some such word as "radiance."

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Brownlow Maitland where he says, summarising St. Paul's ideas: "Redemption is the development of mankind into the Body of Christ. . . . It is God's ideal. . . . and certain, as God's ideals must be, to become actual in God's own time."

He has evidently seized that truth of an ultimate universal restoration, whereof St. Paul is the chief, though not the only exponent in Holy Scripture.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 31st January, 1888.

Reviews and Notices.

"RAPHAEL BEN ISAAC, A TALE OF A.D. 20." By John Bradshaw. 2 vols. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co.

A STORY written of this date is a novelty, if it is nothing else. Mr. Bradshaw's work is interesting in the description it gives of the manners and feelings of the Jews at this time, and the teaching of their great sects. Some short sketches are also given of the Gentile nations within and around the Holy Land.

The hero is a Jewish youth of the higher class, and is still, when the story opens, under the teachers of the law. He finds their teaching empty and unsatisfying, as well he may, if the following is a fair sample of their instruction upon the duty of Sabbath observance.

"Beware of eating an egg which a hen hath laid upon a feast day when that feast day falleth in connection with the Sabbath. Neither let a tailor go forth with his needle on the eve of the preparation, lest he should forget it and so carry a burden upon the Sabbath. Neither let a man walk upon the grass during the seventh day, for to do so the elders have determined to be a lesser kind of threshing. Neither should ye curdle milk on that day seeing that hath been declared a lesser kind of building." And the same rabbi who endeavours to instil into the Jewish youth these rigorous doctrines, at another time, shows them how a man can buy as much as he desires on the Sabbath, by not paying for it until the following day, "for he hath obtained the same as a gift."

The hero tries other phases of Jewish teaching, but with no better results, none of them provide anything for the good of the main body of the nation, the poor. He is at length expelled from the synagogue for taking a Greek in his boat on the Sabbath to a neighbouring

town that the Greek may be in time to see his dying daughter.

With his religious beliefs all unsettled, he flees to Cæsarea and there becomes a partaker in its pleasures and vices. The city is strikingly described, and one short but very realistic glimpse is given of Pontius Pilate and his wife Claudia Procuta, and we think the author has shown more power in this short scene than in any other part of his work.

His fortunes wrecked and conscience awakened, the hero eventually escapes from the snares of Cæsarea, and after coming in contact with other modes of life and thought, he eventually finds his peace in the surrender of self, humility of heart and faith in the advent of a Redeemer who will bring comfort to His people.

Though the story has many defects and hangs rather loosely together, it is written with the useful purpose of enabling us to realise more clearly the condition of the world in which our Lord began His ministry, and attains a certain degree of success.

The dialogue is in parts very weak, but the characters are distinctly drawn, and the descriptions of scenery are good.

“READY.” Miss Robinson’s Monthly Magazine, price 2d. Post free, United Kingdom. 2s. 6d. per annum. Published at the Soldiers’ Institute, Portsmouth.

WE have great pleasure in bringing before the notice of our readers this magazine, which is to be published on the 16th of each month. We can recommend it as being a thoroughly evangelical paper, and we think well adapted for the principal use for which it is designed, viz., circulation amongst soldiers and sailors, as well as calculated to create an interest in our soldiers and sailors amongst all classes. The magazine contains short papers on various subjects of interest, interspersed with narratives. It is calculated to be very useful, and we earnestly hope it may have a large circulation, and thus be the means of not only doing good in itself, but helping to make more widely known Miss Robinson’s valuable institution at Portsmouth.

MESSRS. ROBINSON AND CLEAVER, of Belfast, have recently presented to Her Majesty, as a Jubilee gift, a specimen of their linen manufacture, which shows the perfection to which that industry has been brought in the North of Ireland. The gift itself consists of only two dozen doyleys, which have been woven in Jacquard looms and bear a representation of the manufacturers’ place of business (just completed), The front of which contains life-sized busts of the Queen, the late Prince Consort, and other members of the Royal family. The production of the doyleys has been spread over a considerable time, seven months having been spent in preparing the loom for the weavers to commence. The famous Jacquard looms of Lyons have never turned out more perfect pictures than have here been executed in Ireland. Belfast has long been famous for its linen weaving, but this latest production has outdone all that has gone before. The wrapper in which the doyleys are placed is of pale blue Irish poplin, on which is embroidered by Messrs. Robinson and Cleavers’ workers a wreath containing the letters

V.R.I., and an Imperial crown. This embroidery is wrought in deep gold silk, but so skilfully are the stitches varied as to give the appearance of the diadem being set with jewels. The casket in which the whole is placed is covered with morocco, having the Royal Arms and other emblems emblazoned, and the corners have chastely executed gold mounts. Some idea of the value may be arrived at when we state that the insurance of the parcel, when in transit to the Queen, was £500. We are apt to speak of Ireland as being barren of manufactures, but this gift shows that Ireland has at least one industry in which she is unexcelled.—*Society Times*.

THREE of the Cambridge College Missions—St. John’s, Trinity, and Clare—have just had meetings, and they have on the whole a very encouraging tale to tell. Canon Rowsell preached in Trinity chapel on Sunday morning, and addressed a meeting in a lecture-room at night; his string of anecdotes of his former experience in East London was evidently appreciated by the meeting. Mr. Norman Campbell, the vicar of St. George’s, Camberwell, and Warden of the Trinity Mission, also gave an address; and a capital speech was made by a printer from one of the Mission districts. It appears that Mission work supported by the college is being carried on by two curates, each working at a different centre in this parish of 20,000 inhabitants. In one of these districts a club has been started, and an excellent Mission-room fitted up; at the other a larger site has been secured, and a great deal of effective work is being carried on in the tumble-down buildings which still occupy it. The report of the energy which has been displayed has attracted a considerable number of undergraduates to give personal help in the district during the vacations, and they in turn arouse more interest in the proceedings among their friends here. The Trinity Mission also affords a convenient meeting-place for the friends of the different Missions, and a conference, similar to one held last year, has been fixed for February 13th, when the *Record* report on South London will be the subject of discussion. St. John’s was the first of the colleges to break ground by sending a Mission clergyman to this neglected region, and they are now able to give an excellent report of the progress made. Canon Body preached in the chapel of St. John’s on Sunday morning for the College Mission in Walworth, and he was also the principal speaker at the annual meeting on Monday evening. The Mission is well supported in the college, and many of the undergraduate members have spent some days in Walworth during the vacation. Upwards of £2,000 have been collected for the building of a new Mission-church, which, it is hoped, will soon be begun.

SERMONS were preached on behalf of the Irish Society on Sunday week by the Archbishop of Dublin at the cathedral, and at St. Thomas’s Edinburgh. The English secretary of the society (the Rev. T. Keane) preached at St. Andrew’s. The annual meeting of the Edinburgh Association was held the following day in the Royal Hotel, Dr. Skene in the chair. Among those present were the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Edinburgh, and Dean Montgomery. The first resolution was moved by the Bishop of Edinburgh:—“That this meeting recognises the importance of the work of the Irish Society, and pledges itself to use every effort to advance its cause.” The resolution was seconded by Dr. Wylie, and agreed to.

ON Thursday, 26th ult., the first monthly meeting of the Church of England Burial, Funeral, and Mourning Reform Association was held at the Charterhouse, the Master (Canon Elwyn) in the chair. On the motion of Dr. Hubbard, seconded by the Rev. G. A. M. How, vicar of Bromley-by-Bow, the following resolution was agreed to:—

"That in the present condition of the public health it is imperative that a combined effort should be made on the part of ministers of religion, members of the medical profession, and persons of influence generally, to put a stop to the repulsive, dangerous, and utterly indefensible practice of storing up in the neighbourhood of large populations vast accumulations of human remains in every stage of arrested and prolonged decay."

ON Thursday, the 26th ult., the annual dinner of St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society was held at the First Avenue Hotel, Holborn. Canon Gregory, who presided, in proposing the toast of "The Church and Queen," spoke of the wonderful improvement that had taken place in the matter of the services of the Church during the reign of the Queen. When he first went to St. Paul's, nineteen years ago, the services appeared to the gentlemen of the choir and others to be of little moment, and they attended them when they had no other engagement, but it was not so now. When he suggested some improvements he was urged to "keep the cathedral quiet, or there would be mischief." From that point of view they had done a great deal of mischief on the previous day, for one person had actually said that by the erection of the reredos they had driven the last nail in the coffin of the Church of England. They had made much progress in the last fifty years, but the great danger was a possible reaction. He, however thought they were safe from that, but they must go slowly to go safely. In a subsequent speech Canon Gregory said that it was found that the music of the cathedral attracted people who previously were not in the habit of going to church, and as they came again and again they eventually learnt to say their prayers, and now the reredos was there, as a friend had remarked to him, it would teach the people what to believe. The Decoration Committee had still £30,000 in hand, and he trusted that every year the decoration of the cathedral would be advanced. It had been felt that the real key to the work was to get the altar first. As to the Ecclesiological Society, which had its home in St. Paul's Chapter-house, it had prospered beyond his most sanguine expectations, and he trusted it would continue to flourish.

ON Sunday last special collects, prepared by the Archbishop of York, were said in the churches of Sheffield with reference to the epidemic of small-pox. Preaching at the parish church, Archdeacon Blakeney stated that since the beginning of the year, it was computed that there had been a thousand fresh cases. Though the disease originated generally in the poorest and most squalid districts, the mortality was greatest amongst the well-to-do, and the reason given was because the latter had not been so well protected by vaccination as the poor. The amount of the evil had, however, been exaggerated by an absurd and vicious description in a certain London paper, which had been repeated in other papers throughout the country, and had done very serious damage to the trade of the town. He thought that medical gentlemen in their private practice might persuade all the families they

attended to be revaccinated. He also counselled all infected or who attended upon infected people to keep out of the public assemblies and conveyances of all kinds.—At St. Barnabas's, the Rev. C. A. Goodhart summed up the position thus:—Between three and four thousand people had been attacked during the past ten or eleven months, or about one for every hundred of the population, and of those attacked about one in ten had died.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Bolton, Rev. William Henry, M.A., late Master of Kinver Grammar-school; Vicar of Wick, Pershore.
 Boulter, Rev. Sidney, M.A., Vicar of Fordington, Dorset.
 Clarke, Rev. Benjamin, B.A., Vicar of Marown; Rural Dean for the District of Douglas.
 Gepp, Rev. Charles Granville, M.A., late Master of Lower School, Bradford College, Reading; Vicar of Badsey, Worcestershire.
 Gray, Rev. Frederick Henry, M.A., General Licence for the Diocese of Chichester.
 Green, Rev. Charles Edward Maddison, M.A., Prebendary of Withington Parva in Hereford Cathedral.
 Hall, Rev. J. R. Longley, of Jaffa; Private Chaplain to Bishop Blyth.
 Hamilton, Rev. Charles James, M.A., Vicar of Doveridge, Derbyshire; Honorary Canon of Ashbourne in Southwell Cathedral.
 Ireland, Rev. F., M.A., Senior Curate of West Derby, Liverpool; Rector of Ellough, near Lowestoft.
 Kelk, Rev. A. Hastings, M.A., Minister of Christ Church, Jerusalem; Examining Chaplain to Bishop Blyth.
 Keymer, Rev. Nathaniel, M.A., Rector of Headon-with-Upton, Notts; Honorary Canon of Norwell Overhall in Southwell Cathedral.
 Long, Rev. Henry Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Bamburgh; Rural Dean of Bamburgh.
 Mason, Rev. George Edward, M.A., Rector of Whitwell, Derbyshire; Honorary Canon of Bakewell in Southwell Cathedral.
 Newbolt, Rev. W. C. E., Honorary Canon of Ely Cathedral.
 Perrott, Rev. F. D., M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Smethwick, Staffordshire; Vicar of Ixworth, Suffolk.
 Price, Rev. Clement, M.A., Curate of Alvechurch; Vicar of St. Mary's, Selly Oak, Birmingham.
 Price, Rev. S. J. N., of Beyrout; Chaplain to Bishop Blyth.
 Ranger, Rev. A. C., M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Huddersfield.
 Sale, Rev. C. H., Vicar of Kirby-on-the-Moor; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
 Sneyd, Rev. Clement Broughton, Perpetual Curate of Shocklach, Cheshire.
 Storrs, Rev. C. E., Vicar of St. Paul's, Bedminster; Vicar of Ellacombe, Torquay.
 Strong, Rev. William Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Bradninch; Rector of Pendock, Worcestershire.
 Webster, Rev. Robert, Rector of Millbrook Ampthill, Bedfordshire; Vicar of Crosby Ravensworth, Westmoreland.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Hone, Rev. Joseph Frederick, for sixty years Vicar of Tirley, at Tirley Vicarage, on the 28th ult., aged 86.
 Jenyns, Rev. C. F. G., at Knebworth Rectory, on the 26th ult., aged 80.
 Kelly, Rev. Walter, M.A., Vicar of Preston-cum-Hove from 1834 to 1878, at Hove, on the 22nd ult., aged 84.
 Pigott, Rev. Charles Francis Corbet Rector, and Prebendary of Lichfield, at Edmond Rectory, on the 22nd ult., aged 67.
 Tierney, Rev. Matthew, M.A., eldest son of the late M. J. Tierney, Esq., Bengal Civil Service, at 12, York-place, Clifton, on the 28th ult., aged 59.
 Welland, Rev. Lawrence Palk, B.A., of University College, Oxford, Rector of Talaton, Devon, only son of the late Rev. Laurence Palk Welland, M.A., formerly Rector of Talaton, on Dec. 27th.



The Church of England Pulpit.

PERFECT PEACE.

BY THE BISHOP OF CHESTER.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 15TH, 1888.

"Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee: trust ye in the Lord for ever."—ISAIAH xxvi. 3.

THE experience of a life, really lived; long or short; begun to be realised, or midway in its struggles, or within measurable distance of its close, is full of temptation to look on the quiet mind with which, in one of our most familiar collects, we pray that we may be enabled to serve God, as an end in itself. We come to regard it as a thing to be sought for, not merely as a corollary, or necessary consequence, or mechanical result, of other being, doing and suffering, but as itself the thing for the attaining of which the being, doing, and suffering are the means. Now this quiet mind would seem to be the correlative, in subjective relation, to the peace of God: the peace spiritually apprehended, of which the Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, is the Prince: the peace which the herald angels proclaimed to men of good will, the peace which passeth understanding, which is the crowning blessing that is offered to the sons and servants of the Almighty; the peace of the Psalms and of the Collects; the perfect peace in which He shall be kept, according to the anticipation of the prophet, Whose mind is stayed on Thee because He trusteth in Thee.

There is, I say, in all the experience of life that rises above mere animal mechanic living, a temptation to seek this peace as an end in itself: to seek it, and to expect to find it, without a real experience of the conditions on which it is really to supervene; and so to be, consciously or unconsciously, led to grasp after things and states that are not even true shadows of the true peace, cast before in the prospect of its coming. Is it not so; and are we not warned? Are we not told of those who proclaim Peace, peace, where there is no peace? Has not the Prince of Peace told us that He brings on earth a sword, rather than the sort of peace which might be looked for. Do we not ourselves know of men whose lives are full of a sort of peace which consists in the extinction of all the emotions and interests in which life, as I

said, is really lived? Do we not ourselves know ourselves to be tempted to that seeking of quiet that lies in the neglect of duty, and the hardening of the heart, and the doubting about the Master's will, and the loss rather than the perfection of trust stayed on Him? I think we do, and the longer our experience, the more we know, within and without.

How can there be a quiet mind in the midst of the pressure of distracting cares? From youth to old age we have these cares: What shall be on the morrow? What line of life shall I take up; what am I fitted for? What will be the result of my work, at school, at the University, at my start in life? I cannot leave it to chance, or treat myself as a waif and stray. Or, when the line for good or evil is chosen, how am I to make ends meet, how provide for my family, how guard against losses in business, disappointments, discouragements, failures either by my own shortcomings, or by unforeseen influences and accidents? How am I to make arrangements for my own old age, and the welfare of my children? Rising up early, and late taking rest, how can I take the sleep that my Lord reserves for His beloved; how neglect to take thought for the morrow; how keep under the thoughts which destroy all chance of a quiet mind? Quiet mind, indeed! why, so long as I can keep at work and in excitement, there is some relaxation of the pressure; it is when the quiet time comes that the anxiety becomes most oppressive, and the thoughts most disturbed. Where and what can the peace be? And yet I know that the Father knoweth that I have need of all these things.

Well, it is clear that the cares of this life, and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word; but how about the word itself? And how about the great things of the soul, about sin, and righteousness, and judgment? Are the thoughts of these things conducive to the possession of a quiet mind? I have sinned, grievously, presumptuously, purposely, in despite of grace, and in default of penitence; I have relapsed, I have run after temptation; I have repented, grieved over my folly, mortified my affections, and sinned again. I do it repeating the series, but hating myself and my offences more each time. How can I be sure that I shall ever conquer; O remember not the sins and offences of my youth! Ah! but how canst Thou forget them when they live still in the sins and offences of my age? Yet there is mercy with Thee. And when the struggle is to some extent successful, when the wounded, broken, contrite heart has been brought to Him who will not despise it, and forgiveness has been proclaimed, and fulness of grace assuredly bestowed, is it peace? The conscience cannot forget even when God has forgiven, and there is none in greater need to take heed lest he fall than he who thinketh he standeth. Can there, so long as there is a possibility of sin,

be an altogether quiet mind? And yet I know that His blood cleanseth from all sin, and that His gifts and calling are without repentance; that He has died that I may live.

Further, conscience worries me, not only because of what I have done and left undone, but of what I have to do. The dead past may bury its dead, but I have to live my life, and it is full of duties, and for every duty a question, and for every question at least two answers. It is all full of responsibilities; ah! why should life all labour be? This is no mere self-distressing matter; not a mere thought of eating and drinking; not a mere thought of escaping the penalties for sins which, after all, we have come to hate. It is the great question of my duty towards God and my neighbour. To do the right regardless of consequences! Ah! but which is the right, and how far do the consequences modify, if not the right and wrong, the expediency and the equity of determining between courses of which one is not altogether right, and the other not altogether wrong? And when the choice is made, when the act is done and irrevocable, what searchings of heart are there! After all, it might have been better the other way; after all, more weight should have been attached to this consideration, and less to that; we have put the right man in the wrong place, we have let ourselves be swayed by motives less than the highest, we have been confident of our own judgment, often as it has betrayed us; it is not the right, but our own wilful view of it, that has determined our act. In great things, and in small, it is the same; our very earnestness of intention to do our duty is a source of profound disquietude. Who is, who can be, sufficient for a life like this! And yet I know that, according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not, if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted; and there is peace at the last.

We rise higher: we want truth, we want the truth; we want knowledge, and to test all that offers to give us knowledge; and we have been brought up in the knowledge, or what we were told was the knowledge, of God; the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier; the God of Nature, of Grace, and of Eternal Life: and of that knowledge, we have been taught to seek the Truth, that is to make the knowledge to ourselves the basis of real life, to furnish motives and sanctions, to justify hopes and aspirations, to be the solid and certain issue on which we stake all that we are, and have, and hope for. And the very surpassing importance of this knowledge involves, for each of us, an amount of intellectual testing, and moral experiment, which necessitates questions that suggest doubt. And the beginning of doubt is like the beginning of strife; and the habit of questioning is of inconceivably rapid growth; and all questions cannot be easily solved; and authority itself is liable to question too; and all men around

us are questioning; and many, very many, are doubting; and the foundations seem to be being cast down. The very lessons of the truth that have impressed themselves most deeply, in some cases at least, supply topics of further misgivings. The truth of the Bible, the benevolence of Almighty God; the origin of evil, and of the struggle between evil and good: the intricacy of creative work, the theory of human salvation, the destiny of the individual and the race; the truth of the love of God, and of our own immortality. Can the sluggish mind, to which these questions never come, be the quiet mind; can the arbitrary and tyrannic habit which banishes them all as temptations of the Evil One, be the peace of God? Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief, the prayer which, of all prayers, comes most naturally from the patient heart of the living, thinking man, is itself an evidence against the quietism, the dead intellectual desert; of the mind that dares not or cares not to face a struggle; and if there is a struggle, how and when and where does it close?

And once more: the more real life becomes to us, the wider our sympathies, and also the more intense our interests: as men, as Englishmen and as Churchmen, we have a sense of brotherhood, a sense of responsibility, a sense of identity and unity, consciousness, memory, anticipation, calculation of loss and gain, shame and honour. And this is of a very essence of religion, natural as well as revealed; the brotherhood of man, the sympathy of Christ. And think what all this involves: the differences of schools, the struggles of parties, the wringing of the heartstrings of divided homes; the stirring up of personal rivalries, the unloosing of unbridled tongues; the impatience of defeated and delayed aims; the disparagement of noble ideals; the disappointment of victory which has to be stooped for so low before it can seem to be won; the feeling, so often recurring, "*victrix causa Diis placuit*," but what sort of gods did it please! The man who lives in the life of his Church, his country, and his kind; the man who extends his interest, as his Lord does, entering as far as he can into the lot of his brethren, and so entering as far as he can into the sympathy of his Saviour, has such abundant causes of disquietude, even in the quietest of times, that the very anticipation of peace seems like the shadow of a dream: and yet can he who shuts himself out from all this be said to be a man at all?

But I have said more than enough, trying to summarise the experience of the conscience, the affections, the sympathies, the aspirations, the mind, and heart of the worker in the world. And, as I have gone on, I have indirectly indicated the narcotic, or anodyne, or anæsthetic, by which men are tempted to suppress the causes of disquietude: the substitute for peace. The philosopher living, if it is life at all, away from the tumult of conflicting influences, in isolation; the dogmatist risking all

truth and knowledge on the infallibility of his authority which he dare not test; the burdened conscience, seeking rest in the coma that follows on hysterical excitement, or, as education and constitution vary, in the absolute submission to a direction which would supersede rather than discipline the sense of responsibility; the man of action banishing doubts by turning contemptuously away from all that can be doubted, or risking solution on the formula of the gambler; the speculator casting himself afloat and adrift on the ocean of theories; all these may forget or smother their cares, find peace, enjoy a quiet mind. May they indeed? God help them!

Well, so much scarcely needs illustration, certainly demands no proof. It is no peace to yield to defeat or to despair; it is no peace to shut the eyes to what is going on around us, or to harden our hearts against other men's troubles, nor to drive off the evil day, nor to be content with ignorance;—nor to stand still to see the salvation of God, nor to let to-morrow take thought of things of itself; what can it mean?

Ah, beloved, even this is easier to say than to work. It means a steady and courageous facing of facts, whether sins or sorrows, doubts, difficulties, defeats, or dangers: it means a patient, unrelaxing, persevering watchfulness; it means steady, certain, faithful assurance of hope; it means careful discipline; it means such security of rest as is inherent in the certain anticipation of victory; the straining of every nerve; the handling of every weapon, the training of every exercise that can be made to join in the warfare of the Lord. The peace of God, like the true peace of nations, is a fully armed, a well guarded, a highly trained, a jealously cautious, preparedness for war; but it is for a war in which for the faithful there is no risk of failure. This is your victory that overcometh the world. It is a hard saying, but it is harder still to compass in act and in continuance. The victory for full possession, is future, however certain; the peace that is in the preparedness and in the anticipation of victory, stands in an attitude of patient endurance of present cares. There is no other way of peace, no royal road to victory. Work and prayer as against worldly cares; penitent amendment for past sins and watchfulness against temptation; guarded thoughts and disciplined affections, courageous facing of responsibility, alike remote from morbid self-condemnation and from reckless self-acquittal; patient waiting for the putting away of doubt and difficulty by more perfect vision of truth; above all, and in all, and through all, the sense of the Divine love—the Divine love that knoweth that ye have need of all the things for which you take thought, and will add them to those who seek first His Kingdom and righteousness; the Divine love that yearns more for your salvation than ever you can, and has watched and laboured even unto death on the cross to take away your sin and to redeem

your soul; the Divine love which will judge you, knowing whereof you are made, and remembering the ways in which you are tempted, and apportioning responsibility for causes and results with a discretion all wise and all sympathising; the Divine love which will reveal to the mind that waits for the truth, earnestly seeking and realising all it finds, the length and breadth, and depth, and height of all knowledge, in the knowledge of itself; the Divine love that cares for those whom you love best, causes, persons, and principles, more wisely than you can care, and with which all that is worth saving is safe: the love of Him Whose Body is the Church, and Whose heritage is over the heathen who have not known Him, and Whose heart is most tender towards the sinner, and Whose ear is open to every prayer, whilst His eye is over the righteous seeking peace only in the joy of His countenance. The assurance of that perfect love must cast out fear; and all these cares come of fear, and all such fears come of the lack of faith.

Is this also a matter of words? Rest is the complement of work; peace is the complement, in lives such as ours, of victory; the quiet mind is not the mind which is undisturbed, but that in which the voice of God has quelled, is quelling, and shall quell for ever, the storm of doubt and care, remorse and fear, the dread of judgment, and the surging of evil memories. Can a man live so close to God as to make himself, or be made by grace, habitually conscious of the victory? And in his work enjoying a foretaste of the rest? We have known saintly lives, surely, in which such things have been done, and are being done. God help us to some little measure of such reality for our own selves.

Do you ask me for a practical lesson from the words I have said? I have tried to set a clear truth before you; beyond that, judge your own selves. The sense of the Divine love, in which alone, whether in work or rest, you shall find the possibility of a quiet mind, is worth all the work, all the watching, all the prayer, all the discipline, all the study, all the self-denial, all the sacrifice which it makes possible, and accepts and identifies as a part of its own sacrifice. Abide patiently upon Him: the quiet mind is stayed on Him; the cares cast on Him, the questions solved by Him, the affections glorified by Him. Only—only—look not for the rest without the work, think not of the peace, or even of the victory, without the battle. And if you must pine for rest and peace, look in the work and the battle for the earnest of what shall come by-and-by; He trieth His servants and His soldiers, but He will give the victory: The Lord shall give His people the blessing of peace. "Why art thou so vexed, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted within me? Oh! put thy trust in God. Keep innocency, and take heed unto the thing that is right, for that shall bring a man peace at the last"—at the last!

In beginning this sermon, I used the words, and I have repeated them more than once, "A life really lived." As we quitted church this morning, the solemn music reminded us that within the last few days Oxford has lost one of its most familiar figures, and we, individually and collectively, have lost a friend, who has, in a very full measure, lived a real life. A strong, vigorous, vivid life, full of interest, full of sympathies; full of cares of its own, responsibilities fairly faced, questions fairly asked, and as carefully answered; principles bravely tested, and as bravely contested, in speech and action. Our friend was a man of abundant gifts, unsparingly used; of a wide-ranging, honest intellect, of a most kindly heart; he had great experience of men, long acquaintance and association with those who have marked this age with its peculiar stamp, and himself was influenced by them, as he influenced them in turn. He retained, as we know, to very advanced old age, the vivid interest in men and things which used to mark youth in the days when boys were boys. He realised life throughout with vigour and true thoroughness. And, thanks be to God, we can say of him that the secret of youth was on him continually; he lived and died with the fear and the love of God upon him; a true seeker and a true finder; as a schoolmaster, as a man of the world, as a politician, as a professor, he was a living man all through. God has called him to peace that cannot be broken any more. Young and old, may He find us, when He calls us, watching, on our guard, waiting for the rest, ready to welcome the message; so, Lord, lettest thou Thy servant depart in peace.

SAMUEL, THE LAST JUDGE.

A SERMON BY THE REV. BENJAMIN HUNTER,
B.A., VICAR OF AUKBOROUGH AND WHITTON,
DONCASTER.

SERMON PREACHED AT AUKBOROUGH.

"And the Lord sent Samuel."—1 SAM. vii. 2.

A CONNECTED history of God's people, as a nation, from its cradle to old age, would be useful to us, as we might read in such a history, first, lessons for the ordering of our own Church and nation; then, a thoughtful reader would not fail to find lessons for himself in reference to his own personal and individual spiritual life. A third connection is to be observed in this history: that remarkable manner in which God's Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, seems to be identified in some way with this ancient people,—an instance of which is laid hold of by the evangelist St. Matthew, where he quotes from Hosea the passage, "Out of Egypt have I called My Son." In some one or other, and often in all three of these ways, the history may

be applied; and the Church seems to have had in view some such method of applying the Scriptures when it gives us, in the appointed Sunday first lessons for morning and evening, such a connected history—not as in the daily lessons, taking us through the whole of Scripture, chapter by chapter—but laying hold of (so to speak) some salient point in Israel's history, which seems to be specially useful as "written for our learning."

Such an instance is the story of the Passage over Jordan, inaugurating Joshua's rule; or that of which I spoke last Sunday morning, "Israel and the Judges," instanced in Deborah's and Barak's successful achievement.

To-day I would take as the leading thought of my discourse, the mission of Samuel: "The Lord sent Samuel." He was not the first sent: for if we take the whole verse we find others recalled to memory: "And the Lord sent Jerubbaal, and Bedan, and Jephthah, and Samuel." Those of you who have read through the Book of Judges well know that there were others besides; but, from this verse, it would appear that with Samuel closed one eventful period. He was the last of the judges.

The last two judges, Eli and Samuel, seem to have differed in many respects from those who were before them; all the others had been chosen with reference to their military capacity. The distress of the nation or of a part of it, had roused the zeal of some one man or woman to accomplish its deliverance, and that deliverance had only been accomplished in the course of conflict and battle. We are not told that Eli or Samuel fought in any battle, though the sons of the former fell in battle, and the latter was, at least on one occasion, present during a battle, but on that occasion rather as a pray-er than a fighter. How was this, but that now the more peaceful offices of the judge were attaining importance, and certainly must have been principally occupied by such men as Eli and Samuel. These peaceful offices had in previous history been of no much concern: though when once a judge had gained a position by military renown, he saw the fitness of using his position for bringing about a more settled state of things in civil government. But the early judges did not exist for this; they came on the scene as the result of a military emergency.

Now, in the later history, recorded in the first chapter of the 2nd Samuel, a better state of feeling had begun to prevail. Orderly government had been found beneficial, and is loved for its own sake.

A second difference between the power of the judges is found in the wider area of the judge's influence. From Dan even to Beersheba, as narrated at the end of the third chapter, did the fame of Samuel spread; and the position of Eli, as high priest of the whole nation, drew to him the aspira-

tions and reverence of all the twelve tribes. Eli and Samuel were judges of the nation, not of a few tribes. This was a second distinct gain ; indicating the prevalence among the Israelites of a higher perception of the benefit of national unity.

Thirdly. The rulers of the nation have henceforth a sacred character. True, the former judges had this to some extent, as having been raised up "by God" to accomplish a deliverance ; but they did not presume to be religious teachers, nor did they set up their conduct for example ; in fact, the moral relations of many of them would not bear scrutiny. Clearly, then, the sanctity of their appointment was confined to the immediate object of the deliverance which they were destined to accomplish, except so far as all government and authority must be considered divinely ordered. But the case was different with Eli and Samuel ; the one was the high priest, and the priest's lips should keep knowledge ; the priests were the authorized instructors of the people in spiritual things ; and then Samuel was "a prophet of the Lord," one whose especial calling it was to reveal the will of God to the people. Thus we find in these two, Eli and Samuel, the two last judges, the civil office of governor and the sacred office of priest or prophet, *i.e.*, in either case a spiritual teacher, combined. Here was a new arrangement, not meant to be permanent ; but, none the less, it afforded a new point of departure. For when kings came to be at the head of the government in Israel, they were looked up to as spiritual heads, nursing fathers of the Church, and they were always looked to as examples of religious conduct. Thus on the religiousness or otherwise of the king hung the whole religious character of the nation. It was, I think, as a preparation for endowing the kingly office with a quasi-religious character : that ensued this transition-period under two judges holding religious offices besides the office of judge. Henceforth, whoever ruled over Israel must be clearly and openly on God's side, otherwise must take the consequences in incurring the Divine displeasure. This had not been so clear with respect to former judges. The Almighty seems to have winked at the times of this ignorance ; but henceforward the people were to be trained to the adoption of a higher standard of moral and religious principle. Religion must be a predominant principle with the governor as well as with the governed. The ordinary ministry of the priesthood in Eli, and the extraordinary ministry of the prophet in Samuel, combined as they were with the civil office of judge, contributed much to the attainment of this changed order of things. We see, therefore, the Divine hand at work in the times of the two last, as in those of the early judges. Then, it was order evolving light out of chaos ; now, the light has come, and we are prepared for the orderly succession of day and night and the seasons. The times of Samuel and Eli are the

transition-period between the anarchy and irregular succession of the judges, and the establishment of order and a regular succession and government under the kings.

Fourth. In this transition-period God put His mark clearly on every thing. Before this there had been no open vision. Now God, in Samuel's case particularly, shows a desire to re-establish personal communication with His people. From a child Samuel had been entrusted with revelations concerning the spiritual well-being of the nation. Neither does God leave off His communications with him. The other judges had an angelic visitation, mostly on their appointment ; some not even that. But God speaks to Samuel (as to Moses) almost face to face. We seem to find re-established the same sort of intercommunication as we found in Genesis and Exodus : "As I have been with Abraham so will I be with you." The book of Judges seemed to leave a gap in these communications. They were few and far between, and did not dictate the will of God in the ordinary current of life. As I said in my sermon on the previous period, the people were being left to themselves to find their way under God's providential guidance, but with little of His direct inspiration. Now there is always a prophet, a man of God in their midst.

From the consideration of the foregoing remarks I would impress upon you—

First. The importance of the peaceful offices of government. We have often in the Old Testament the titles given to the Almighty : "Lord of Hosts or armies," The Psalmist even calls Him a "God of War." But we Christians are taught to acknowledge a "Prince of Peace." We are to seek for the things that make for peace. While admitting the importance of war, and preparedness for war, and even the necessity of war in certain cases—and war has an importance of its own, or God would not have raised up (in the time of the judges) a special class of agents for carrying it on—yet must we put in a higher rank the art of peace : they are the more excellent way : the order and harmony that can only exist in time of peace are most agreeable to the desire of the Almighty. The completed rule of Christ is to be signalled by the beating of swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning-hooks. And every Christian must endeavour to do his part towards bringing this about by as far as lieth in him living peaceably with all men. So peace is the sphere wherein increase in growth towards perfection must take place, whether in a nation or in an individual soul. As the Head of the body, the Church, is Christ, so the head of every man is Christ, the Prince of Peace. Recognise His peaceful sway by, so far as pertaineth to you, conferring on your nation, your Church, your family, your soul, the benefit of peace.

2. So with the wider influence which flowed from

the acts of Eli and Samuel, following in the train of the wider area of their jurisdiction.

It is not well to put the parish before the nation, or the city ward before the State. Even in politics we learn a lesson here: to subordinate our own selfish interests to the welfare of the nation. To feel ourselves all members of a great body, a great empire. Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member rejoice, all the members rejoice with it. And as with the nation so with the Church. The splitting up into rival sects cannot be conducive to prosperity in holy things. A higher form of union should prevail, than simply contentment to let each others' forms of faith stand on sufferance, which goes by the specious name of charity. We want a real unity in order to show the world what spirit we are of. Of course, kindness and cordiality by the Church and the sects towards each other, are so far good; as a straw shows which way the wind blows, these may be auguries of better things to come. But we must all strive towards a higher ideal. Then this unity is not without its influence on our personal religion: it gives individuals strength to be able to move as one man; to feel the sympathy of God's whole Church flowing towards us, towards the little babe offered at the font, towards the married pair seeking His own blessing at the altar, towards the sick on his couch, the mourners at the grave. The Church, offering these offices in the plenitude of its sympathy, felt as such, coming from the whole body, instead of being regarded as merely a performance of the individual clergyman, would command the beating of a thousand hearts. Such is the union and unity for which the Church longs; a union that shall bring blessing to every individual within it.

The third subject suggested by the text, the sacred character of the ruler, is certainly deserving deep attention at the present day, when dreams are indulged in of divorcing religion from government. This divorce has never been the Divine plan. "By Me kings rule," speaks the Almighty. The throne shall be established in righteousness. Whether the dissolution of a national Church could be carried out without such a divorce of Religion from Government must be a problem hard of solution. Our fears in the event of such a catastrophe must predominate over our hopes. If our fears were to be justified, what would be the gain? If irreligion, infidelity, indifference to all revealed truth, were installed in high places, would it not be a retrograde step? Where would we end? Tithe-free holdings, remission of education rates, exemption from county rates, and such expedients as the would-be spoliators of Christ's Church offer as bribes to the pockets of the people, would be too dear a price for broken altars, a dishonoured God, and the general laxity of tone that must follow the withdrawal by the rulers of the nation from their proper position of nursing

Fathers to the Church. No blessing could be anticipated from such a move. Religion and government, if we believe the Bible, ought to go hand in hand.

The fourth subject suggested by the text was the opening anew for the Jewish nation of a line of constant communication between them and the Almighty in the order of prophets, which seemed to disappear in Moses but to be renewed in Samuel; the constant and direct intervention by God in these affairs in a measure which had never been usual under the former judges. This was a distinctive characteristic of this period. Have not we of the Christian Church had the same, or at least 'a similar line of communication opened to us in the dispensation of the Holy Spirit? At Pentecost this Holy Spirit, confined previously to certain bounds and persons, became the common heritage of all the Church's members. The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart, the things prepared by God for this dispensation; but He hath revealed them to us by His Spirit. We have the *open vision* now. The Lord ordereth a good man's way. There is no step in life, no most trivial act, even to the finding of the stray asses (see 1 Sam. x. 14), wherein "the seer," that is the "Holy Spirit," will not give us direction. At an early stage of our spiritual life we may, as Israel in the time of the judges, be dimly conscious of Divine help. We may be groping our way through a mass of corruption, and want the light, the Divine hand may be leading us all the same; but we seem to be tunnelling out our own way, and that very clumsily; but a time arrives in every one's spiritual life, when all comes out more plainly, we have more sure the prophetic word, the day spring arises in our heart, hope dawns, faith brightens, charity warms, we go on our way rejoicing. And how is this? It is that intercommunication between us and divinity has become re-established, and this through the agency of God the Holy Ghost.

MR. JAMES KNOTT, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, has presented to the council of the Mission to Deep Sea Fishermen a 58-ton sailing yacht, suitable for their work among the smackmen of the North Sea.

IN the year 1882 a deputation came up from Edinburgh to congratulate the Queen upon her providential escape when fired upon at Windsor Station, and Mr. Gladstone was among those who had been invited to meet the Scottish divines. After dinner Mr. Gladstone remarked to one of them, "We do not hear much of attacks on the Scottish Church now. I think you may consider yourselves pretty safe." The following day Dr. Begg repeated the saying with some satisfaction to Archbishop Tait, who, much to his surprise, remarked, "Was that all? And you are pleased? Take my advice. Look out for squalls!" —*National Church.*



NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 6d., six months, 4s. 6d., twelve months, 8s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1888.

THE PEACE-LOVING MENNONITES.

AMID the fertile meadows of Friesland, in East Holland, near the town of Bolsward, there stood, for many centuries, a flourishing Abbey, bearing the name of the Oldeclooster. In 1535 it was the scene of a terrible conflict. A party of 300 excited Anabaptists, headed by one Peter Holtsagher, and accompanied by many women and children, marched upon the Abbey, took the monks by surprise, and expelled them from their comfortable dwelling. The Abbot appealed to the Governor of Friesland for help, and a regiment of soldiers, with artillery, soon appeared upon the scene. The Anabaptists, refusing to surrender, were subjected to a siege of several days; but at length they were overpowered, and the victors took cruel vengeance upon them. A gallows was erected outside the Abbey, on which twenty-four of the Anabaptists were at once hanged, fifteen more were beheaded, and the rest of the men were slaughtered in various ways. The women and girls were taken to Leeuwarden, and drowned in the canal, close to the old Guard-house, which is still to be seen by the visitor to that city.

Amongst the victims of this massacre, was an Anabaptist named Simonsz, whose brother Menno, then a Roman Catholic priest, witnessed his death. This scene made a profound impression upon Menno. It gave him a lifelong horror of war, and of every form of either offensive or defensive fighting. He admired the zeal and fervour of the Anabaptists so much that he became convinced of the truth of some of their leading principles, and, leaving the Roman Church, joined their body. But he would have nothing to do with arms thenceforth. After what he had witnessed, his whole

soul shrunk with detestation from every kind of resort to the sword. He saw that both the Anabaptists and the German Reformers generally had made a great mistake in resorting to force for the propagation and defence of their religious tenets. Menno, therefore, advocated a policy of non-resistance and of absolute reliance on the Divine protection, and on the convincing power of truth in itself. But most of his contemporaries were unprepared for such a doctrine as this. The Anabaptists, like the Cromwellian Puritans of the following century, were active partisans of Jewish and Old Testament modes of dealing with their enemies; so Menno had to withdraw from his new friends. On the other hand, the German Reformers treated him with even more decided contempt, so that speedily poor Menno found himself, like his Divine Master, "despised and rejected of men." A price was set upon his head, and for a long period he was literally a fugitive and a wanderer upon the earth.

But he steadfastly adhered to his pacific convictions, and gradually his gentle, loving spirit and his fidelity, at any price, to non-resistance principles, attracted to him the love and respect of a few friends, who entreated him to become their minister and teacher. The number of these adherents increased, in spite of persecution. Amongst their bitter opponents was Martin Luther; but another German, a warrior nobleman, of Holstein, Count Ahlefeld, was so struck with admiration of the meek but brave heroism of Menno, that he offered him an asylum, on his own estate, near Hamburg. There, sheltered from all foes, whether Catholic or Protestant, Menno spent the last few years of his life, and there, at the age of sixty-three, he peacefully died, in 1559 (just after the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the English throne).

He had become the founder of a Church of many thousand adherents, who became known by the name of Mennonites, and, as such, retain an organised existence to the present day. They have chiefly inhabited Friesland, North Germany, and the Vosges mountains, west of the Rhine; but under the stress of occasional interference with their scruples, many of them have emigrated, in the first place, to South Russia, and more recently to the United States and Manitoba.

Menno's views strikingly resembled and anticipated those of the Society of Friends, who came into existence nearly one hundred years after his decease. Some of his followers subsequently joined that body, and amongst them was William Sewell, the Quaker historian. Like that body, Menno not only taught non-resistance principles, but also advocated great simplicity of life. He held that a college training was not necessary as a preparation for the ministry, and also insisted that the ministers amongst his people should render their services gratuitously. He established a strict

but loving Church discipline, under the administration chiefly of officers named "Elders." When members of a Mennonite congregation moved from one locality to another, they were expected to bring with them "certificates" of good character from their former brethren and elders. One of the primary rules of their body was as follows:—

"In respect to the wearing of arms, the Elders cannot deem it allowable that any member should so far comply with the ordinary fashion, as to carry a rapier, or even a staff; but all participation in warfare, even at the command of the Government, is quite forbidden by the Elders, except in regard to the unarmed servants of members."

Towards the authorities everywhere, both in Holland and Germany, the Mennonites, acting on their Founder's example and precept, manifested a most loyal and respectful submission. Their special devotion to commerce and industry, together with their harmless and virtuous behaviour, won for them the high appreciation of the most warlike monarchs. And it is a very important and noteworthy historic fact, that these gentle, consistently non-resistant people have obtained and enjoyed, during nearly three centuries, more practical regard to their conscientious scruples, and more executive indulgence from demands of military service, than any of the other Protestant denominations on the Continent.

They have contributed so largely to local and civic prosperity, in various districts, that even German Emperors and Russian Czars have invited them to settle in their dominions, on the express condition that they should, amongst other privileges, enjoy absolute exemption from military service. And it is further noteworthy that only when some of the Mennonites themselves manifested a disposition to relax their ancient fidelity to pacific principle, did the military Governments attempt to deprive them of the exemptions won and maintained by them during ages of surrounding violence.

But, as is the case with some other people, long prosperity relaxed the pristine fervour of the Mennonites in various ways. They gradually abandoned some of their original simplicity; they desired a more learned ministry, and set up training colleges for their pastors. Their young people were not brought up to the old hatred of warfare; and so, gradually, at least in Germany and Holland, they have lost their hard won and long cherished privilege of exemption from military service.

The Prussian King, in 1847, manifested some disposition to curtail their privileges, but at length, in 1867, Bismarck and the present Emperor took the decisive step of withdrawing from the German Mennonites their exemption from the conscription and from military obligations. But in recognition of their past services to the state, certain alleviations of this rigorous order were permitted. In a

few instances, hospital or other unarmed public service was allowed in lieu of joining the army; and in other cases, faithfully conscientious members of the sect were permitted special facilities for emigration to America or elsewhere. But the young Mennonites, in general, have, since 1867, been placed on the same footing, as to the conscription, with other Germans.

And it must be confessed that these Mennonite youths have, in most instances, shown that they had not been trained to prize the convictions of their forefathers; their peace principles had already been widely relaxed. In 1870, hundreds of them willingly took up arms against France. This circumstance is recorded by a modern Mennonite historian, Mr. Max Schön, with gratification. And he adds, that he, like his brothers of the sect, was proud to take a part in what he terms "that glorious war against the hereditary enemy of the German nation."

But some of the Mennonites, elsewhere, have been faithful to their earlier convictions. Especially in South Russia, where also the modern Government has withdrawn the former privileges of exemption from military service, many hundreds of the sect have quietly refused to comply, and, in consequence, have emigrated to America, chiefly to Manitoba, where they have carried their great skill in the cultivation of hemp, which, whilst they lived in Russia, had been so profitable to the resources of that Empire. But now their Manitoban hemp trade is becoming a formidable rival to the Russian commerce in the same material. It was a very foolish policy, on the part of the Russian Government, thus to drive away such profitable subjects.

Many Mennonites still remain in Holland, especially in Friesland, where they retain much of the religious earnestness of their forefathers. But it is to be desired that both they and their German brethren had more consistently and lovingly adhered to the pacific and Christ-like doctrine and practice of their brave but gentle founder, Menno Simonsz. The declension of the Continental Mennonites from their former detestation of militarism, conveys an instructive reminder to the friends of Peace everywhere, of the importance of a frequent recurrence to the example of the Saviour Himself.

RUMOUR alleges that the response from non-resident members of the Senate of Cambridge University, to the recently circulated appeal to oppose the granting of degrees to women has been very ready. It is said that something like two thousand members of the Senate are unwilling to take any step towards turning Cambridge into a mixed University. It thus appears that the feeling of the residents reflects the feeling of the whole body of the Senate much more accurately than the advocates of change supposed.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHERE IS HONESTY TO BE FOUND?

SIR,—I might also look around upon our religious papers, and say, Where can honesty get a hearing? But, thank God! we can get it in THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT. My question now however, is, where is it to be found?

2. You and your readers have heard *ad nauseam* our position, that here in Ireland, when it was attempted to put regeneration out of our Baptismal services, the Low party were backed up by the Broad and Philosophers. This, though the latter knew well that regeneration in our services, could not, as the Low pretended, mean conversion. The Broad were not idiots—they knew that our Reformers were not idiots either, to thank God for the impossible conversion of infants; or to pray for the adult quaker or heathen, brought to the font as already converted, that he should be converted over again. Then as to the Athanasian Creed, we have shown *ad nauseam*, that the Low, holding as well as we, the “necessity of believing rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ,” backed up the Broad in striking it out of the Athanasian Creed. This we have made as plain out of the voting lists, as plain as the sun in the heavens. An attempt was made to draw a red herring across the scent, as if we said that there was a treaty, offensive and defensive between the parties—a Herod and Pontius Pilate treaty—but we said no such thing—if it existed, how could we know? Surely we should not have been let into the baby-house, if baby-house there were. But this is all childish. All we said is, that one party helped the other, contrary to its conscience. A charge, grave enough, without weighting it by absurd conditions and aggravations, of which no one could know. Either party may say of the other, in Horace’s words, “*de te, de te, fabula narratur.*” Dishonesty sticks to each party alike.

3. But now we turn to a third party, the Crypto-Romanists. May not the same thing *de te* be said of them? It may, alas! We have two safeguards against a belief in a Corporal Presence and the adoration thereof. The one is the Black Rubric, which says that our Lord’s Body is now a Natural Body like ours, and that it is not here, but in heaven; and that it is not to be adored as present on the altar. This Rubric is utterly despised. In our Irish Church paper, a writer was allowed without rebuke, to say that it has “no binding force whatever,” a paper which professes to admit nothing contrary to the Prayer Book. How a clergyman who is ready to subscribe this Rubric, whenever promotion requires him to do so, how a clergyman can honestly despise this Rubric passes my comprehension. Again, how a layman can trample on it, and remain in communion, is another question, though a difficult one too. But suppose we could get rid of the Black Rubric, what would that avail? Is not our Lord’s risen body a natural body? Was it not so proved by the hands of the Apostles? If it be not bound to one place, as St. Augustine says, it would not be a real body, not the body that suffered at all. The Black Rubric is built on truths, truths that *must* stand, though it were blotted out of the Prayer Book. But it is not blotted out; and every honest Irish

clergyman should remember that, if it was not strengthened by our Synod, it was because when they tried to do so, they found it impossible. But suppose the Black Rubric erased, how is the matter altered? Not in the least! We still—besides the principle that a natural Body cannot, as a Body, be locally in two places at once—we still have the fourth Article. It is of no use pretending that our Lord’s Body ceased to be a natural Body on His ascension. This Article says that He ascended with a Body having “all things appertaining to the perfection of man’s nature.” Is not a perfect man confined to one place? And does not the Article say that, as He ascended with our perfect nature, so He sitteth, until He return? The article must follow the Black Rubric into the waste paper basket before an honest clergyman can hold “the ninety places at once” theory. An English Church paper tries to get rid of the Articles by saying that they apply only to exploded controversies, or some such stuff as that. But in Ireland our Church paper has not had the boldness, as yet, to trample on the Articles. How soon they will share the fate of the Black Rubric I know not.

4. When I showed up the Popery of our Crypto-Romanists, not a word of backing-up have I had from either the Low party or the Broad. They knew I spoke the plain truth, but they let me be stamped as a slanderer. Where, I may add, is honesty to be found?

Next I turn to the part played by the High Church party; when they see me maligned for showing up, how, *against them* in the Synod and their brave defence of the Prayer Book, the Broad helped the Low to make out that regeneration in the Baptismal Service meant conversion, and again maligned me for showing up how, *against them* in the Synod, and their brave defence of the Athanasian Creed, the Low helped the Broad to exclude the necessity of believing rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, though the Low hold its necessity as well as we do. Why, when I was maligned for stating what the High knew to be gospel truth, why were and are the High silent? Why did none of them stand by me? Because I exposed their Crypto-Romanism! Therefore I am to be crushed, *per fas et nefas*!

5. I may return to my text, “Where is honesty to be found?” To the Crypto-Romanist, as well as to the Low and Broad parties, it may be said, in the hackneyed words of Horace, “*nomine mutato, de te, de Te, fabula narratur.*”

6. Yet is there not an honest party in the Church? Yes, thank God, there is! With the Low, we do not hold that infants are converted, or converted adults converted over again in Baptism. We neither thank God for what we hold impossible, nor ask Him for what we believe He has already given. With the Broad, we do not join the Low in objections, known as absurd, against the Baptismal Services. With the Broad, we do not hold that a belief as to our Lord’s Incarnation is unnecessary. Neither, with the Low, do we pretend to believe so, holding the contrary. With the Crypto-Romanists, we do not sign Rubrics and Articles which we turn into ridicule. We believe that our Lord’s words, “This is My Body,” refer to His Body slain, not now existing; that they refer not at all to His living, glorified Body; that there is no material presence of His Body in or with the elements, but a grace from it in heaven, which we receive with the bread as the means; and that, on account of this grace, our Lord calls the bread His Body, the grace being really and objectively present. Thus we can

honestly sign the Rubric and the Article against the Crypto-Romanists, and the Baptismal Services and the Athanasian Creed against the Low section and the Broad. This honest party we believe to be the salt which will save the Church from the corruptions of Popery and infidelity: and we maintain our faith and our belief, in defiance of all that the enemies on either hand can say against it and us. Here is honesty to be found: and we thank God that there is still a paper, like yours, which will allow our honesty to have an open utterance.

7. Pray do not discuss all this as an Irish question. It is a sign of the times. It is raging, I doubt not, with you, as well as with us. Honesty, like faith, is vanishing from the earth. Let every true man stand by it, lest, when the Son of Man cometh, He may find no vestige of it remaining. It is a pity to have to show up our faults before jeering Romanists and Dissenters. But our own health is at stake. It is better that others should know our disease than that we should not know it ourselves, and correct it, before iniquity be our ruin.

EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.

SIR,—Canon Dwyer writes in the PULPIT of the 4th inst., of the debates in the Synod of the Church of Ireland about the Athanasian Creed:—"And so things went on, until people opened their eyes (to which remonstrances, addressed to the representative body in respect of duty, largely contributed)." I ask with much respect and in pure ignorance, what the words in brackets can possibly mean? The representative body, as your English readers may not be aware, is distinct from the general Synod; it is a board of trustees in which the endowments of the Church are vested, and has very large powers in some ways, but no powers whatever to enforce ecclesiastical discipline. As a diocesan lay secretary I have special opportunities of seeing its working, and I have never heard it suspected of using its powers in the interest of any religious party.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

February 8th, 1888.

[Want of space prevents our inserting other letters on this subject, which appears to us to have been already sufficiently discussed.—ED.]

ST. JOHN VI. 58.

SIR,—*"Inquirens"* is virtually right in his interpretation of this passage. The bread of God from heaven is the Divine nature of Christ. He would be absolutely right, I think, if he took *bread* in this passage as a figure of such Divine nature. In the same figurative language the flesh and blood of Christ in this chapter represent the nature of God in Christ, which feeds our spirits. The elementary particles in the thing nourished and in that which nourishes it are identical. Bread is therefore body or flesh, so that our Lord pronounced a real physical fact when He said, "This Bread is My body."

MEDICUS.

SIR,—It appears to me that your correspondent *"Inquirens"* furnishes materials for the answer to his question, if he does not actually answer it. Our Lord's

discourse, St. John vi. 26 to 65, is evidently on His own sacrifice, and on the representative and memorial sacrifice of the Eucharist, which He connects, as He did also in the institution of it at the last Passover with His own sacrifice. Yet so carefully did He guard His disciples from any carnal (or according to the flesh) apprehension concerning the Eucharist, that He pointed to His ascension (ver. 62) as illustrating and making necessary the truth that "it is the Spirit that quickeneth." Accordingly, the bread which He gave, His flesh, for the life of the world, in His sacrifice on the cross, is representatively (*re-presentatively*) given to the faithful in the Holy Communion.

But there is a difference between both the purpose and the operation of the sacrifice for the life of the world, and the purpose and operation of the representative sacrifice. The first was to impart life—eternal life—to that which had it not before—the world. The second is to continue and nourish life—eternal life—in those persons who partake of it. This distinction pervades the whole discourse in St. John 6th. Our Lord likens Himself to manna which came down from heaven, and was eaten by men; but He distinguishes as well as likens, because those who ate manna did not live for ever (or unto eternity); while those who eat the living bread that came down from heaven, live unto eternity. I desire to call your correspondents' attention to the parallelism between ver. 58, which he cites, and vv. 49, 50. I suggest also to him, is he quite correct in thinking that our Lord's natural body cannot have, in any sense, come down from heaven? Why may it not be said, as literally as we say of many things, that the body conceived by the Holy Ghost came down from heaven?

I write with no intention of dogmatising, on a subject whereon opinions differ, and I suppose will continue to differ. Respecting the difficulty started, if it be a difficulty, I desire only to ask if our Lord's Body ascended up to where it was before, ver. 62, is there not an implication that "to come down from heaven," is not a figurative but very real description. Or do I read ver. 62 wrongly?

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

February 5th, 1888.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE THEOLOGICAL EDUCATOR." London: Hodder & Stoughton.—"A Hebrew Grammar." Rev. W. H. Lowe, M.A., pp. 59. 1887. "An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed." Rev. J. E. Yonge, M.A., pp. 157. 1888. "A Manual of the Book of Common Prayer." Rev. Charles Hole, B.A., pp. 276. 1887.

OF each of these three volumes of the "Theological Educator," we can say that the print and binding are excellent; and, as regards the first, this is a most important matter.

And it would have been impossible to have placed the first book on our list into better hands. Mr. Lowe has, in conjunction with Mr. Jennings, written an excellent commentary on the Psalms, and is the author of a commentary on Zechariah, which we reviewed at the time it appeared. It is needless, therefore, to speak either of the care or scholarship

displayed in this little volume,—all that we expected ; what does surprise us, is the immense quantity of information Mr. Lowe has succeeded in compressing into fifty-eight pages and thirty-three tables. He has written not so much a manual of, as the essence of, Hebrew Grammar. It is of course true that Hebrew is not generally studied till after boyhood is over, and therefore the writer of a Hebrew Grammar, unlike the writer of a Latin Grammar, need not put his powders into jam. Only once have we found any concession to human weakness, and an excellent concession it is :—

“ § 106. To find the root [of verbs] observe the following rules :

The *servile* letters cast away,
And if behind *three* letters stay,
You have the root without delay.

As מִלְחָמוֹתֶיךָ, rt. לָחַם.
But if you have not letters three,
The root will then defective be.
Perhaps you then may find it soon
Under *initial* yūd or nūn.

As תִּשָּׁב, rt. יָשַׁב, rt. נָפַל.
A *medial* vāu or yūd may show
The letters three you want to know.

As בָּנָא, rt. בָּנוּא, rt. קוּם.
Perhaps the radical that's second
To make the three must twice be reckoned.

As סָבַהוּ, rt. סָבַח.
Or finally, perhaps you may
Require to *add* a final hē.

As וַעֲלֵ, rt. עָלָה.

The present writer heartily wishes he had been so fortunate as to have had these few simple rules before him when he taught himself Hebrew ; they would have saved him many and many a bad quarter of an hour.

The second book on our list consists of twelve short chapters, and an appendix containing the Nicene Creed in English and Greek, with critical remarks ; the Athanasian Creed in English and Latin ; and a list of ancient heresies. But Mr. Yonge is weak where Mr. Lowe is strong. He might have found space for a great deal more very needful matter in his 158 pages, if he would have simply referred to texts instead of quoting them. There was no need on page 54 to give us the well-known prophecy of Isaiah (ix. 6, 7) in full, nor to quote Eph. i. 20-23 in full on page 46. We know the reply—You *must* quote, people will not refer to their Bibles. That may be sufficient answer in a book designed for popular use and for general reading, but is quite out of place here. Manuals have their uses, if however they pander to idleness they have also their abuses. Moreover, by not quoting, the student is led to use his Greek Testament instead of an English Bible. Still, the manual is a good one, but might have been better.

Mr. Hole does not seem to aim at condensation ; he gives us thirty-nine chapters—is this number a graceful compliment to the Articles?—a glossary (and a very good one), and some examination questions. We are a little suspicious of examination questions, they savour of “cram.” Since Mr. Hole often refers from one section of his book to another, it is a pity the number of the section was not printed in the margin at the top of the page. On page 156, section 165 is a misprint for section 166. The chapter on the

Creeds is very good. Mr. Hole does not give the originals, but notes important clauses ; as, for instance, “ God of God, Light of Light ” (*Deum de Deo. Lumen de Lumine* ; Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φῶτος). It is a pity he did not add an injunction to read it so ; the clergy are most perverse in their mis-reading of prepositions ; they *will* say, “ Lord have mercy UPON us,” but *won't* say, “ God OF God,” though the whole force and meaning of the phrase lies in the ἐκ. There are few things more vexing than to hear a man who ought to know better, gabble out his “ God-of-God, Light-of-Light,” as fast as his choir can follow, and without showing the slightest sign that he understands what he is reading. But probably Mr. Hole would say that to do this would have been travelling outside his brief. However, he has written a decidedly readable as well as useful manual, better and more useful than Bishop Barry's “ Teacher's Prayer-book,” but not equal to Campion and Beaumont's “ Prayer-book Interleaved.”

SAFETY.

O THOU, from Whom all blessing flows !
Lamp of the world, whose holy light
No rising and no setting knows,
And maketh all the shadows bright !

Because the Light of Light Thou art,
From Whom the darkness cannot hide,
This weak and fearful human heart
Can dare in darkness to abide.

No evil can befall to me,
Under Thy shelter safely kept ;
And when I wake I am still with Thee,
For Thou wast with me while I slept.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

BURIAL REFORM.—A special effort was made last week in the diocese of Canterbury to make known the need of burial reform. Sermons were preached by the honorary secretary in Canterbury, urging that greater prominence be given to the victory wrought by Christ over death. Conferences were held in the Guildhall, Canterbury, and at Margate and St. Peter's, Isle of Thanet, in which the Right Rev. Bishop of Dover, the Dean of Canterbury, the Vicar of Margate, the Rev. J. G. Wood, and others took part ; stress being laid upon the danger to the public health incurred by deferred interment, and by the use of palls. An address was given to the chapter of the rural deanery of Ashford, the Rector of Pluckley, rural Dean, in the chair, when a unanimous vote of approval was accorded to the Society's aims. A lecture was given by the Secretary at Pluckley, entitled, “ Recollections of Two Visits to the East,” with reference to the death and resurrection of Christ, and lessons to be learned therefrom. During the week communications were sent to the chief newspapers in the diocese, and many leaflets distributed.

A MEETING of the friends and supporters of Toynbee Hall was held in King's College, Cambridge, on Monday night ; the Vice-Provost took the chair, and there was a good attendance. Mr. Gardner, the

Sub-Warden, and Mr. Benjamin Jones, of the Co-operative Wholesale Society, who have their place of business in Whitechapel, attended as a deputation; their speeches were well received, and had the merit of calling forth several pointed questions and suggestive remarks.

ON Saturday, the 18th inst., at three o'clock, the new Hall connected with the Oxford House, Bethnal-green, in Victoria Park-square, Cambridge-road, will be formally opened by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The chair will be taken by the Warden of Kible College, who will be supported by the Bishop of Bedford, the Warden of All Souls', the Hon. and Rev. A. G. Lawley, the Rev. H. B. Bromby and others.

THE death is announced of the Rev. Reginald Pyndar Turner, M.A., for forty-seven years Rector of Kidderminster.

THE annual tea meeting given by the committee of the Scripture Readers' Association to the readers and their wives took place on Friday evening, the 3rd inst., in the dining-hall of King's College, Strand. Dr. Wace, in an address, referred to the fact that King's College was established some fifty years ago for the purpose of diffusing sound secular and religious knowledge in harmony with the principles of the Church of England, and in lending the Scripture Readers' Association the use of a room from month to month for the purpose of Bible study under the auspices of the clerical secretary, and in welcoming the readers as they did on this present occasion, the council of the college were only carrying out the intention of the founders. He observed that, at any rate since the Reformation, the distinctive mark of the English Church had been that it was a Bible-reading Church. Dealing with the objections urged against the authenticity of the Scriptures, and more especially of the Gospels, he stated as a fact that most of those which several years ago were thought unanswerable had been shown to be baseless, and had been given up by the critics themselves, although still frequently paraded by their more ignorant followers. He urged the readers to try and realise more fully for themselves and to impress upon those whom they visited the actuality of the persons and events recorded in the Gospels. He concluded by referring to a case which had come under his own observation when labouring as a curate several years ago. He had been visiting a sick man and reading portions of Scripture, when he was met by the remark, "Yes, that's all very well; but I never saw any one trying to live up to it." He could not but sorrowfully admit to himself that there was some truth in this. The man subsequently went to a convalescent home and returned a believer. The secret of the change was that his heart had been touched by the Christ-like and self-sacrificing lives of the Christian ladies who had tended and instructed him in the home, and he had judged the tree by its fruits. This, then, was the lesson he would venture to leave with them—that our lives and conduct must be in harmony with God's Word, which it was our privilege to teach.—The association is employing over 120 readers in the metropolitan portions of the dioceses of London, Rochester, and St. Alban's. Their work is greatly valued by the clergy under whom they are placed, and the committee would gladly increase their numbers if their funds permitted.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Ainsworth, Rev. James, B.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Luke's, Bermondsey.
- Andrew, Rev. J. E., Curate of Tideswell; Vicar of Derwent Woodlands, Derbyshire.
- Ayerst, Rev. George H., B.A., Bursar and Assistant Tutor of Ayerst Hall, and Senior Assistant Curate of St. Barnabas's, Cambridge; Principal of the Operative Jewish Converts Institution, Palestine Place, and Missionary of the London Jews' Society.
- Cheeseman, Rev. Henry Jordan, B.A., Association Secretary of the Irish Church Missions Society; Licensed to Preach within the Diocese of Ripon.
- Coulthard, Rev. Ernest N., Curate of St. Mary's, Kilburn; Metropolitan Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society.
- Davenport, Rev. George Horatio, M.A., Vicar of Yazor, Hereford.
- Graham, Rev. John, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in St. Stephen's Mission-room, Buckhurst Hill.
- Hadden, Rev. Robert Henry, B.A., Curate; Vicar of St. Botolph-without-Aldgate, London.
- Hammond, Rev. C. E., M.A., Rector of Wootton, Northampton; Vicar of Menheniot, Liskeard.
- Jones, Rev. Frank, B.D., Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Forest Hill.
- Kempson, Rev. Edwin Alfred, Vicar of Merton.
- Lewis, Rev. Daniel Rowland, B.A., Curate of Llanaber; Perpetual Curate of the District Chapelry of Bontddu, Merioneth.
- Longley, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Grainthorpe; Rector of Coniscliffe, Grimsby.
- Morton, Rev. John Francis, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Somers Town.
- Nutt, Rev. John W., M.A., Rector of Harrietsham; Rector of Chelsfield, Kent.
- Pearman, Rev. William Allwright, M.A., Vicar of Bishop Burton, Yorkshire.
- Powell, Rev. J. R., Rector of Buckland Filleigh, Devon; Chaplain to the Lord Chancellor.
- Preston, Rev. G., M.A., late Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge, Head Master of the King's School, Chester; Rector of Great Fransham, Norfolk.
- Scott, Rev. Walter Ffolliott, M.A., Vicar of St. Jude's, Peckham.
- Seifferth, Rev. C. B., Chaplain Her Majesty's Penal Settlement, Massaruni; Rector of St. Peter's, Leguan, British Guiana.
- Sharp, Rev. Mountague Richard, M.A., Curate of Wolsingham, Darlington.
- Smith, Rev. Harry Percival, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Stephen's, Battersea.
- Smith, Rev. John Philip, M.A., Vicar of Marston, Oxfordshire; Vicar of Street, Dartmouth.
- Tapper, Rev. Isaac William, Perpetual Curate of St. Andrew's, Battersea.
- Tudor, Rev. Owen Lechmere, M.A., Senior Curate of Christ Church, Eastbourne; Vicar of Willingdon, Sussex.
- Weigall, Rev. Gilbert, B.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Lambeth.
- Willis, Rev. Newcombe, B.A., Rector of Nursted, Kent.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Barlow-Poole, Rev. T. G., Vicar of Newbury, at St. John's Vicarage, Newbury, on the 3rd inst., aged 44.
- Hawes, Rev. Thomas Henry, B.D., over thirty years Rector of Burgh Castle, at Burgh Castle Rectory, on the 2nd inst., aged 82.
- James, Rev. John, Vicar of Long Sutton, Somerset, on the 29th Jan., aged 74.
- Martin, Rev. Richard, Canon of Truro, and formerly Vicar of Menheniot, at Heath Lodge, Upton-on-Severn, on the 3rd inst., aged 85.
- Turner, Rev. Reginald Pyndar, M.A., forty-seven years Rector of Kidderminster, at Churchill Rectory, Kidderminster, on the 31st January, aged 77.



The Church of England Pulpit.

NEW YEAR'S THOUGHTS FOR SOLDIERS.

BY W. PAKENHAM WALSH, D.D., BISHOP
OF OSSORY.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE GARRISON CHURCH,
KILKENNY, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 1ST, 1888.

"Ye have not passed this way heretofore."—JOSHUA iii. 4.

IT was a great commander who addressed these words to his soldiers, 3,000 years ago, at the beginning of a great campaign. The army of Israel was about to cross the Jordan, and to conquer the promised land, and Joshua is reminding them that the region was unknown to them, that it was an enemy's country, and that they therefore needed direction and caution in their progress. In this crisis he reminds them of the guide which they were to follow. It was the ark of God; that ark which contained His law, and which was the symbol of His presence; that ark on the mercy seat of which the blood of the sacrifices was sprinkled, and which to them was the type of their salvation—"When ye see the ark of the covenant of the Lord . . . then ye shall remove from your place and go after it." He tells them that they were to let it go before them at some distance, "that ye may know the way by which ye must go; for ye have not passed this way heretofore." These were their general's orders to his troops, and it was by observing and obeying them that their victories were won. We have in these words a very suitable message for ourselves at all times, and one especially appropriate at the beginning of another year. We are like travellers on a road that we never travelled before. We are like soldiers entering upon a campaign in a foreign territory. We know little of the changes and chances, the perils and temptations that lie before us in the untrodden future; and therefore we stand in need of help and guidance that we may be kept right in the journeys we have to take, and that we may prove victorious in the spiritual conflicts in which we have to engage. I remember that at the battle of Tel-el-Kebir, the general gave the command of the Highland brigade to a brave young officer. He was to precede the other troops and to march direct on the camp of the enemy in the darkness of the night, and he had no guide except the stars. Everything depended on his success, and his success mainly depended on his leading his soldiers direct to their destination. He did so, but he fell mortally wounded in the moment of victory. The

Vol. XXV.—No. 634.

general galloped up and took the young hero by the hand. "I hope, sir," said the dying officer, "that I did my duty satisfactorily; I tried to lead them straight." "Nothing could have been done better," replied the General; "You have secured our victory." The brave soldier heard the commendation; a smile of satisfaction passed across his face, and he lay back and died. Everything in that case depended upon the men being well led and the straight path being taken. And we need a Captain who will guide us straight and lead us on to victory. Christ is the only one who can do this. The ark of Israel was only a type of Him. He is the embodiment of God's presence. He is the fulfiller of God's commandments. It is by His precious blood alone we can be saved. We need Him as our Saviour, and He is able and willing to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him. We need Him as our Leader and Guide to direct us by His word and by His Spirit, and He is able to lead us to victory and to make us more than conquerors. We need His presence, and if we have it we need fear no evil. We need His help, for we have dangers and temptations to encounter, and we are weak and helpless in ourselves. Is it not important for us to consider all this at the beginning of a new year? We have just entered upon it, but who can tell what it will bring; what conflicts and dangers may lie before us; what struggles with Satan and with sin? what assaults of the world, the flesh, and the devil? Shall we dare to commence our journey and engage in these conflicts without flying to His cross for pardon and to His Holy Spirit for help? "We have not passed this way heretofore." The words are most suitable to you, my friends. Soldiers are often on the move; they have no permanent abode; they move from one station and one garrison to another; and not unfrequently from one country to another. I believe the regiment is leaving Kilkenny soon and going to Limerick. We are sorry for it, because the 45th have created a good impression while they have been here by their orderly behaviour and good conduct; and this remark extends to the whole garrison, both to the artillery and infantry. Let me say too that we owe special thanks to the officers and men for their frequent and kindly help in matters belonging to our Church and its institutions. The band too has often aided us in our concerts, bazaars, and Young Men's Society; and for all this I beg leave, in the name of my people, to thank you most heartily. I hope to be in Limerick shortly, and as I know many there, it will give me sincere pleasure to bear my testimony to your good conduct and soldierly behaviour whilst you were here. Let me give you one special piece of advice as you move to any new station. It is the same as John the Baptist gave to the soldiers in this day. When they asked him, "And what shall we do?" He said to them, "Do violence to no man." In other words

"Be peaceable and inoffensive; let no one ever say that you began strife or contention with civilians; if ever unhappily any conflict with them should arise let the blame of it rest on others and not on you." And now I turn to the draft of men who are shortly to proceed to India. You are going not only to a strange land, but you are going from a Christian land to a heathen one, and you are going there as the representatives of a Christian Queen and a Christian country. You will have it in your power to do either much good or much harm there by your conduct. The idea of Christianity that many of these poor heathen will form will be determined by your conduct. They may be favourably impressed towards it by what they see in you, or they may be confirmed in their opposition to it. I have often heard our missionaries say, "The soldiers are either our best friends or our greatest enemies." "If they are sober, virtuous, religious, it strengthens our hands; if they are intemperate, vicious and ungodly, they weaken them; for the heathen say at once, "Why should we become Christians, if Christianity would only make us like these men? Beware, my friends, how you put a stumbling-block in their way. Seek rather to uphold religion and to exemplify it in their presence. Do not let the name of Christ be blasphemed among the heathen through your neglect of Christian duties. Rather seek for grace to set such an example that they may be constrained to say that "God is with you of a truth." In this way you would further missionary work, and be in a measure missionaries yourselves. You have two great things in your favour in going to India. First, the honour and prestige of the British army have gone before you. There is not a victory inscribed upon your regimental colours that is not already known and spoken of in that distant land. Even the very battles in which our armies have defeated their mighty hosts have raised you in their estimation as brave men and good soldiers. But in the next place, and this is a great advantage, you will find that the names held in highest honour in India are the names of Christian soldiers, men who have lived for Christ as well as for their country. It is a long and illustrious roll; let me select three names from it. And first General John Nicholson, the hero of Delhi, who led the storming of that great citadel, and who for his resistless bravery was actually worshipped as a demigod by the natives, was in early life a member of the congregation of which I had charge for twenty years. What did he do before he went out to India as a young ensign? He went to his clergyman's study, and knelt down and said, "Sir, I want you to pray for me and to give me your blessing before I go." And when he came back for a while from India what did he do? He went to the same study, and said, "Sir, I want to give thanks to God for bringing me home safely." There are few names more honoured in India

than that of Sir Henry Lawrence. That brave man held the Residency at Lucknow against the mutineers, and died at his post. When his staff stood around his dying couch, actually sobbing for their loss, he spoke words of faith and comfort to them, and words of sympathy for the soldiers who had suffered in the siege. "Don't make a fuss about me," said the noble hero, "bury me with the men." Those are the kind of officers the men are ready to follow, and with whom they are ready to die. And what shall I say of Havelock? His words to General Outram deserve to be remembered:—"I have so ruled my life for forty years, that when death should come I might meet it face to face without fear." "Come," said he to his son when he was dying, "come and see how a Christian can die." A staff officer once said to Lord Hardinge, "Havelock, my lord, is every inch a soldier." "Yes," was the reply, "but he is more; he is every inch a Christian." Yes, it is a grand thing to be every inch a soldier, but a far grander thing to be every inch a Christian. And why should not every one of you be both? Begin at the Cross of Christ, to find there peace with God, and then give your hearts and lives to His blessed service. Ask His guidance and His grace to strengthen you for what is right, to fortify you against what is wrong; and then, come peace or war, come life or death, you shall be safe and happy. You have begun a new year: begin it with God; begin it with prayer; begin it with humble but earnest resolutions. Seek to be Christians not in name only, but in reality, and then whether you are at home or abroad, God will give you His guidance and His blessing. He will enable you to win victories over self and sin more glorious far than any of those emblazoned on your banners; and finally He will give you that crown of glory that fadeth not away. I give you now my parting blessing, and shall follow you with my earnest prayers.

THE DUTY OF PARENTS.

BY THE REV. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A., VICAR OF BRIGSTOCK.

A SERMON PREACHED IN BRIGSTOCK CHURCH, AT THE CHILDREN'S SERVICE, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 29TH, 1888.

"But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them. And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."—2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

TIMOTHY, to whom the words of the text were addressed, was a young minister. The Apostle who wrote them had great affection for him. He called him "my son." The reason of the epistle, whence the text is taken, on reading it

abundantly appears. The apostle knew the nature of the work and the difficulties attending it. He also knew all about Timothy, and that he needed timely advice and kind encouragement. Who that works in the cause of Christ has not felt all this? We do not purpose to take the text in this connection. It will serve to suggest a few thoughts suitable to the present occasion.

We have in Timothy a young man eminently fitted for his work. He was chosen for it and appointed to it by one who would not "lay his hands suddenly on any man." The work was important, and such as would suffer much at the hands of unskilful and untrained men. It was work, indeed, in which no novice could be engaged without great fear of mischief. The apostle was not likely, therefore, in such a case to make an ill-judged appointment. Circumstances clearly show that in all he did he was right. Timothy fulfilled the duties of his office.

Now what was it that so admirably fitted Timothy for his work? Our text gives the answer. This answer we purpose to examine a little in detail. And lest we should be met with an objection of such a nature as shall be thought to spoil the whole argument, making it null and void, let us anticipate it and clear it out of the way.

The objection will take this shape: The training which Timothy received fitted him for his work, but it would not do for all, inasmuch as all are not going to be preachers of the Gospel. This is a very plausible objection, but it only lies on the surface. Let us first remark that the apostle did not regard his qualifications as having their chief merit in the fact that they eminently fitted him for his work in this world. Far from this. Their merit lay in the fact that he was "wise unto salvation." Salvation is every man's chief concern. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all things else shall be added unto you." But it was just because he was prepared for heaven, that he was a fit and proper person to fulfil his duties here. Those duties in his case were those of the minister of Christ; but the truth is absolutely and universally true, he that is best prepared for heaven is best prepared for earth. The training that does most for heaven does most for this world. How will this follow from Timothy's case?

It would take us far out of our way, and take up more time than we could give, to examine this in detail. We will, therefore, only indicate a few of the lines of thought which are focussed here. Timothy would require *knowledge*—knowledge of men, manners and time, knowledge of God, heaven and truth, knowledge of means, ways and appliances, and knowledge of evil, the world and the devil. (2.) *Wisdom*, Timothy would need to be "wise as a serpent, while harmless as a dove." It is not enough to possess information. He must be wise to use it where and when it was best. (3.) *Common Sense*. Sanctified common sense.

A man, when he professes Christianity, cannot afford to forego the exercise of this very needful faculty. No man needs it more than the Christian minister. (4.) *Holy boldness*. No man that reads carefully an account of the work of the apostle's will fail to see how needful was this requisite. Timothy had all these. There are doubtless other qualifications, and of these we may acquire some insight by noticing how the apostle refers to himself. He says, *supra*, "thou hast fully known my doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, long-suffering, charity, patience, persecutions and afflictions." We may from other parts of his writings discern other indications which clearly show that he was such a man as the world but rarely sees. Paul was pre-eminently fitted for his work. Timothy was a worthy successor. We ask and ask confidently where are the elements of character which being other than these, will better fit a man for the pursuits of this life? We shall seek in vain for an answer. There is none. The more a man has of Timothy's qualifications, the more noble will be his pursuits; and for ignoble things no man should live.

What then was it that so eminently fitted Timothy for his work? We may put the question another way, and so make it more fitting to this occasion. What is it that supplies men and women with those qualifications which best fit them for life here? We will put the question in a more homely shape still—How can men best get on in life? The answer is given in our text. It is a satisfactory answer—the only satisfactory one. Let us examine it. We shall notice three points briefly.

I. He was taught the Holy Scripture. The Jews were very careful to teach their children the truths of their sacred books. In this they set us a good example. Timothy was so taught and was "made wise unto salvation." But the Scriptures not only make us "wise unto salvation," they also make us wise in and with salvation. So the apostle speaks of them as "being profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The teaching of the Scripture then served to form Timothy's character. It was from them he derived that knowledge and wisdom which so "thoroughly furnished him unto all good works." St. Paul could say to him, with some hope, "Show thyself a workman that needeth not to be ashamed."

Now, whatever men may say to the contrary, the condition of mankind remains unaltered. Man's relation to God continues ever the same from the first till now. It militates not with facts that some men try to persuade themselves and others succeed that these things are not so. Men's foolish opinions cannot change God's truth. Man by nature is very far gone from original righteousness and from the presence of God; and nothing but the truths of the Bible, felt and believed, can bring

him back to God, and restore him to His favour. Nothing—and we say it emphatically—will teach him so well “to learn and labour to get his own living. . . .” Nothing is so well calculated to make him a good citizen, a faithful friend, an obedient child, a true husband, a loving father, as the teaching of the Bible. This teaching is calculated to change all his relationships in life and replace whatever is bad in them by what is good. There is no teaching like that of the Bible.

And it is important, when speaking of this teaching, to understand by it the teaching of the Bible pure and simple. We must here distinguish between what the Bible says of itself, and what many people say of it. This teaching can only be understood by constant reading of the Bible, and comparing of passage with passage. And in doing all this, there is a point we must never forget. To understand, God must teach. We should read the Bible under divine guidance, and, so to speak, on our knees.

Now this is a point that many like to controvert. We should rather learn, say they, such things as will help us to get on in life. We do not need Bible teaching to understand the affairs of life; to do business we must know the maxims of the world and the affairs of men. Teach the children then anything but the truths of the Bible. How sadly these opinions have spread and worked perniciously time alone can tell. It will be seen in the character of Englishmen in future generations, and we of this shall bear the blame.

We have already seen that there was nothing like Bible teaching to produce the character of a true man. We might see from many parts of Scripture, that a man whose character is so formed is the best for this work-a-day world, but we will refer only to one passage, the words of the psalmist. “The entrance of Thy words giveth light.” This is absolute. The man is in every sense better for knowing aright God’s truth. Whatever his work is, he can do it better.

We should then as parents and patriots desire nothing so much as that our children should be taught to know and understand the Scriptures.

II. He was taught when young. Everywhere in Holy Scripture is the importance of early training insisted upon. “Thou shalt teach thy children,” is the command of Moses. “They that seek Me early shall find Me,” is what we find in the prophets. “Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth,” is the sum of the wise man’s teaching on this point. He further says, “Train up a child in the way he should go,” and adds a promise, “When he is old he will not depart from it.” The Saviour’s teaching is no less explicit, “Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.” Timothy was instructed when young. St. Paul says, “from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures.”

There are many reasons for teaching the Scriptures to young people. We have already shown that they are, of all things, best calculated to form the character, and this, of itself, is a very important reason. There are other reasons. Children can learn more readily than grown up people. The lessons imparted to youth are more lasting. The imagination is more impressionable. Children may die. They cannot die prepared unless they are taught.

We may not here suppose that children will, while they remain children, learn all that there is to learn. No, far from it. Old men, the oldest, do not in their longest days acquire all the divine knowledge that they may profitably learn. There is a point suggested by these present observations that might, only for the time, be very profitably discussed, viz. this, how far people make a mistake in supposing that their learning ceases with their youth. It may, however, be well to remind ourselves that this present life is a probationary state, and that this implies that our education—our spiritual education—is never finished. We have always ourselves work to do. We shall do it best when we think of the children.

III. He was taught by his mother. The natural teachers of children are the parents, and especially the mothers. Good mothers make good children. This should lead mothers to exclaim, What manner of persons ought we to be! The responsibility which attaches to parents is a very great and serious one. But then parents will ask if the case be so, why have schools—day and Sunday schools? We answer, the school ought to supplement the parents’ work, not supplant it. Here we are led to notice—and we shall do it briefly—what should be the nature of the teaching in schools.

The first object of all school-work should be to form character. We ought to emphasise this observation, because there is too great a tendency in these days rather to inform the mind. It is enough if children be made receptacles of knowledge. It is clear from our text, and from the general teaching of the Bible, that such views are erroneous. Unless knowledge makes men better it is practically worthless. Now, if this should be the character of all schools, it should be especially so of Sunday schools. The teaching in a Sunday school should be scriptural. The teachers should be Bible-loving teachers. The principle that should actuate them may find its best expression in some such words as these, We wish to teach the children the truths of the Bible, because we know that they alone can make “wise unto salvation.”

This is the best requisite in a Sunday School teacher. It is far better—if a choice must be made—than intellectual ability. Graces are better than gifts. We need such teachers everywhere. Why do they not abound? Why have we in our case to complain? This question should cause great searchings of heart. The Sunday school, of

all spheres of labour, is the one which affords least scope for vanity, and one where least of all applause may be won. The true Sunday school teacher works from no other principle than that of love for God and love for little ones. In this we have, the fear is, also the explanation of the difficulty in these matters. What then? Is there no blame? There is much every way. Children of God cannot choose whether they will work for God or not? There is no choice. Necessity is laid upon them. They may not excuse themselves by inability, want of time, other engagements, or what not. The work lies before them; their duty, as it is their privilege, is to do it heartily and cheerfully. God has no dumb, deaf, or idle children. Let all whom these things concern calmly and prayerfully think them out. In such a case we should have no lack of Christian workers and Sunday school teachers.

But to return for a moment to the duties of parents in the matter of teaching their children. They must see that their children be taught "all such things as they ought to know, and believe to their souls' health." This duty does not begin and end with simply seeing that the children be sent regularly and punctually to school. It involves the further duties of teaching by precept and example. The Christian mother will, therefore, take a pleasure in asking questions of her children about what they have learnt at school. She will take the first interest in the children, and regard the teacher as helping her in the work which is peculiarly hers. But all is not yet done. Precept must have the back-ground of good example. All moral teaching without this is practically worthless. Parents will be found in their places at "the hour of prayer to worship in spirit and in truth." And, as in the great and most important duties, so in all the details of life, they will show that they have God always before their eyes. Their children will take knowledge of them and see that they have learnt of Jesus.

One more thought, Timothy's mother "believed," see Acts xvi. 1. St. Paul speaks of her "unfeigned faith." Here was the secret of her power and her success. We must have faith: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye should say to this mountain, Be thou removed and be thou cast into the sea, and it should obey you." There will be many mountains of difficulties in our work to be removed. Faith is the power. We must get faith. This comes in answer to prayer—"Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief."

Thus praying and thus believing, and withal zealously working, we may expect good results to come of all our endeavours. "Our labour shall not be in vain in the Lord," "Our children shall grow up and be as olive-branches round about our tables."

May the Lord add His blessing for His Son's sake! Amen.

THEIR NET BRAKE.

BY THE REV. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A.,
CHAPLAIN AT GOTHENBURG.

"Their net brake."—LUKE v. 6.

ONE reason why I see, myself, little or no difficulty in believing in the miracles of our Blessed Lord is this: they are so wonderfully complete, so exactly adapted to His purpose, and so essentially educational. There is never the least sign of extravagance about them; they are parables from nature, outward and visible signs of the spiritual laws which Christ proclaimed. I feel sure that there is a wonderful mine of the deepest teaching to be worked yet in following out this suggestion—that the parables and miracles are intimately connected: that they depend on each other and explain each other: that they both are glimpses into the realm of spiritual law.

Take the incident before us, and let us see if it has not a truly great meaning; if it does not show us, as in a living drama, something of the laws of our nature, a glance at the eternities. It is shortly this: After preaching from Simon Peter's boat, which was lying by the shore, Jesus suggested that they should try for a haul of fish. In the daytime, Peter thought this was not a very likely venture; however, he tried, saying, "Master, we have toiled all the night and have taken nothing; nevertheless, at Thy word I will let down the net." The result may have been merely a singular coincidence, or it may have been that Jesus had, as a man of intense mental power and activity, seen evidence of the presence in the water of an unusual number of fishes, or it may also be, though the Evangelist St. Luke gives no reason at all, but barely states facts, it may also be that we have here a miracle. But to this last view all the circumstances of the case point us. However, the result was that the venture, made through the command of Christ, was successful; "they inclosed a great multitude of fishes," so much so that not only did the net break with the strain, but the weight of fish overloaded both Simon's boat and his partners'. When they came to land, our Lord gave what is surely a most unexpected moral to the lesson (and the lesson conveyed helps to fix the miraculous character, in my opinion); as He said, "Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men." In answer to which strange conclusion of a most strange scene we read that they forsook all and followed Him.

I. Let us try and look at this as it would strike those concerned, and then we shall see its power. Our Lord sees that these good souls, Simon and the rest, have had a very disappointing experience; they have toiled all the night in vain; they are now patiently washing their nets. He determines that they shall learn that God is the Lord of the

harvest: that "the sea is His, and He made it;" that He is able, when the need is certain, to give freely what men would fain seek too desperately; and at the same time He will show them the limit of God's intervention; show them the weakness of all things mortal, the insufficiency of the highest earthly blessings; show, in a word, that when God has blessed us in life with success, He must still, by leaving us to the ordinary working of nature, let us feel that, in the very moment of the realization of our earthly ambition, the finger of God writes on the wall before our eyes the warning that all things here have an end.

For think: they were men, these; men with a natural desire for success: with that desire, to some extent, we may be sure, which the Jews had of old, as much as modern society has now—the extraordinary eagerness for wealth; they, in their trade, were as desirous of prosperity, as men may rightly be, to some extent, in all honest trades. Therefore, when God so intervened to bless their work, rewarding their labours with a success never before heard of, they must have felt that this was a never-to-be-forgotten day—this a never-to-be-forgotten draught of fishes. But when the success is at its height, the blessing most apparent, the goodness of God most clearly perceptible—just at the crowning-point of their life-work (for never again, so long as they lived, should such a success be theirs) THEN came the warning of fate in the rending of the net. God has given them the fish; He will let them know that He no further interferes with the common laws of things earthly. It is well for them to see this. He breaks their delusion of earthly glory as He lets the meshes of that net give way, and at the same time summons them to a loftier and nobler life, where they shall lay up for themselves eternal treasures. When they brought their boats to land they forsook all and followed Christ. The broken net, with the fishes it held, was laid as a willing sacrifice at the feet of Jesus their Lord. Christ showed them the "more excellent way."

II. This incident does not address itself to the careless or worldly, nor to the sins and follies of men. These were disciples already; they were following their proper calling, they were obedient to the command of Christ in their very work, they were specially blest in that work at the very moment that they were shown its insufficiency and limit. We are therefore lifted into a higher level than that of the struggle between sin and salvation. The point becomes this: when and in the very act of finding your life, as a man or woman, most successful, most wonderfully and clearly marked by the blessing of God, are you prepared then, and just then, to rise straightway and follow Him? This I am certain of, that in the full flow of prosperity God will not leave you without that gentle reminder of the end which He gave these

men by letting things take their course, in the breaking of the net under the strain of earth's good gifts.

You are sober, industrious, religious; you walk in the fear of God; you try manfully to conduct yourself as a Christian should do; you seek God's blessing on your life, and on the work of your hands; you have learned enough to know that He alone is the Giver of all good things, and to Him alone do you trust for the needed increase. And God, perhaps, has made your way prosper; you can say like Jacob, "With my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two bands." And yet you too, I doubt not, shall find that in the very moment of triumph and thankfulness, in the midst of the richest mercies of God's providence for you, there is the inevitable reminder present to show you the limit of your capacity. The net begins to break just when it is fullest.

For so Jacob, in the moment of his triumph, returning a rich and prosperous man, to the river Jordan, which he had crossed years before, with nothing but his stick in his hand, finds the inevitable warning given. That day he met the angel of God: that day he struggled and wrestled with the power of heaven, and from that day he went lame. He halted on his stick: for God touched his thigh, and the sinew shrank. But from that day too, friends, Jacob became a better man than he had ever been before, a more spiritually-minded man, more humble and trustful; that halting thigh, with its shrunken sinew, showed him the limit of his nature. He now turned more readily from earth to heaven.

Indeed, I go further, and venture to challenge every single person here, who has passed out of the fresh joyousness of childhood, to say if it is not true that every "castle in the air," when you come to examine it, when you reach your ambition, has a big crack somewhere in the foundations. The world is full of gaps and cracks and ugly quagmires; so that we can never say, Here is perfection at last!

The fact is, our nature is not fitted for unmixed blessings. When God showers them upon us, it only serves to disclose some weakness in us. Mind, I am not now alluding to sin in any way. I speak to you, as I have reason to think I may, as men and women who take their life from the hands of God with thankfulness, and a due sense of responsibility. And yet it often has been found—and why not here as elsewhere? most certainly have I found it—that when God lets our prosperity, our blessing in any form slip from us (by its own weight, shall we say? I mean in a perfectly natural manner) we have found that this was but to introduce us to more perfect, because more spiritual experience.

Nay! take the earthly blessing to its highest pitch. Leave all consideration of mere bodily comforts: take the blessing of the hearth and home; the

pure joys of family life; the noble pleasures of intellect, in art and science and literature; fill to the full the cup of joy in the intercourse of friends, in the love of loved ones; in the unselfish pleasures of rejoicing in another's life, in his success, in his prosperity, in his or her fulness of blessing—(and there is nothing higher of that which is earthly)—and then you have tested the net of your capacity to the utmost. What say you? Is there not always some little flaw? some giving way of the meshes? some breaking of the net? Disease; adversity, death, some wrong, some disappointment, some failure, the long dark shadow of a past ill deed: in one way and another God lets us feel the insufficiency of our earthly life, even in the moment when we see, and feel, and love the hand of our Father upon us for good.

Yes: and this principle must be carried out to the full. When men come to you and offer you their theories of life, test them. What strain will they bear? Will they suffice to account for the sweetness and loveliness of a young child's mind? Will they, at the same time, suffice to show us the light in the dark days of death, when a man looks out into the great unknown; will it make him brave and humble as he enters it? Will it cleanse the heart from sin? And will it also give a man strength in the burden and heat of the work-time of life? and comfort and console him in its trials? Or will it fail, when tested, to hold men secure? The net of many a philosophical theory breaks, friends, even with the strain of a mortal man's weight upon it. The Gospel net will not break so—the net wherewith Christ fishes for the souls of men.

Let us say, Thank God for life; life is good. Thank God for success; success is His blessing on our work. Thank God for the pure joys of earth; but thank God, above all for His merciful warning, which never fails in the midst of all. Thank God for my broken nets as well as for my heap of fishes.

But now a word as to the conclusion of this matter. Is it love or wrath which makes God leave us so at the mercy of our nature? which thus allows us to so often meet disappointment? Does He give us blessing in vain? Does He bless us only that we may be the more sad after? No! No! God has a more excellent way. "You have seen," He says to us in the experience of life, as He said to the apostles in this miracle, "you have seen that I do not grudge my children their life; that I would rather add to it than diminish it; but you have seen, too, that this life of yours has many limits. Come, then, with Me, and I will show you a new life, a new gain, a new source of blessings, which shall be eternal. These very fish are dead, and will soon be gone: your net is already broken in the very receiving of them. Come, then, henceforth you shall catch men. You shall know the joys of God, the blessing of

giving life, the grandeur of working for the eternal kingdom."

For there is just one point—so far as we have yet discovered—just one point in our human nature, where our strength can be made perfect; where there is no limit to our possibilities; where we may have the fulness of the richest blessings of God put upon us, and grow stronger by them. Of the life of Christ in the soul the capacity has no limit. In the work His Spirit may do with you, there are no drawbacks. This spirit of Christ makes a man able to endure more than patiently—thankfully—the rending of the cords of life.

You my brethren who know the power of the Gospel, of Salvation have you not sometimes learned afterwards to thank God for some of the disappointments you have had? Has not the shock of pain raised your eyes in more humble prayer to God? Has not the sting of sin made you understand more fully your need of the Saviour? Has not the weakness of your mortal nature made you ask more earnestly for the help of God's Holy Spirit? Has not the rending of your earthly life made you more eager to set out on the long brave journey after Christ towards the Heavenly Kingdom? I know it has.

THE *Record* states that Miss K. Tristram, a daughter of the Canon, has been unconditionally accepted by the Church Missionary Society, and appointed to Japan.

BISHOP BARDSLEY has intimated to his clergy that, in obedience to an invitation from the Archbishop of York, he will be absent from his diocese (Sodor and Man) almost the entire season of Lent.—*Manchester Guardian*.

CHANCELLOR LEEKE has accepted the chaplaincy of the Lincoln County Hospital, in succession to the Rev. J. Stock, to whom a pension of £30 has been granted. Mr. Leeke has generously undertaken that the cost to the institution, including even the pension of the retired chaplain, shall not exceed the amount previously paid by the hospital authorities.

ERRATA.—By an inadvertence the sermon by the Rev. Canon Scott Holland, which appeared in the PULPIT of the 4th inst., was printed before some corrections in his proof could be made. The corrections are as follows:—Page 49, 13th line from top of second column, *for secured read seemed*; 21st line, *for possible read impossible*. Page 50, 25th line from top of first column, *for at love read the love*; 6th line from top of second column, *for twilight read daylight*; 3rd line from bottom of second column, *for We read They*. Page 51, 26th line from top of second column, *for charges read force*. Page 52, 6th line from top of first column, *for this read it is*; 23rd line, *for were read are*; 24th line, *for resolved read resolve*; 34th line, *for into read in it*; 22nd line from bottom of first column, *strike out and*; 18th line, *for error of ours read self horror*; 12th line, *for sin read flesh*. 25th line from top of second column, *for then read this*; 26th line, *strike out work*.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA.
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
 and all Pulmonary
 Affections can be
 immediately re-
 lieved and rapidly
CURED
 by simply
 using
 the

AMMONIAPHONE

FOR
 THE
 Voice,
 Throat,
 Chest,
 and Lungs.

21s. post free.
 WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by
 the Royal Family, and principal
 Physicians, Clergymen,
 Vocalists, and Public Speakers
 throughout the country. New illustrated
 Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of
 Testimonials **FREE OF CHARGE**
 may be had
 on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1888.

DARWINISM AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.—I.

THREE excellent and judicious articles on "Darwinism and the Christian Faith" have appeared in the *Guardian** since "The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin" have been published. It was suggested by the editor of the *Pulpit* that some account of the same subject would not be uninteresting to the readers of the latter.

The author of the articles in question proposed two questions: "How far Darwinism affects the Christian Faith," and "What are the points of traditional interpretation or apology which are modified by it?" Observing that Christian theology has no fear of scientific discoveries, he regards "evolution as now fairly claiming to be an established doctrine," but wisely adds that "in saying this, we do not mean that evolution is stereotyped in the form in which Darwin gave it to the world." To illustrate this, he alludes to Dr. Weismann's "germ-plasma" theory, and Mr. Romanes' "physiological selection," as hypotheses advanced so late as last year to account for the origin and persistence of new varieties. Darwinism includes two factors—"Descent with modification," *i.e.*, evolution, and "Natural Selection." It is the former which is the "established doctrine," the title not committing any believer in it to any definite theory of *cause* whatever; while the latter, or natural selection, may or may not be an efficient means whereby to interpret evolution. Mr. Darwin himself laid little stress on the importance of knowing whence or

how the variations in plants and animals came into existence, as long as they were present for natural selection to act upon.* According to Professor Weismann, "Sexual propagation may be regarded as a source of individual variability, furnishing material for the operation of natural selection."† The author appears to have misread this, for he says: "According to Professor Weismann, natural selection is the main cause of such variations." Both the Duke of Argyll, in his "Reign of Law," and Mr. Romanes, as well as others, have observed that natural selection is not a theory of the origin of species, and the latter offers the following as his interpretation: "Wherever among all the possible variations of the highly variable reproductive system, there arises towards any parent form any degree of sterility which does not extend to the varietal form, there a new species must arise." The author only adduces these two suggestions to show that scientists are still concerned with investigations as to the *causes* of variations more or less apart from natural selection, and that natural selection is by no means as an accepted a doctrine as is evolution itself, which Darwin would make dependent upon it.

The author now comes to the consideration of evolution and the Christian faith, and though he heads the articles "Darwinism and the Christian Faith," he drops for the time further consideration of Darwin's special theory of natural selection, and observes that the first question is, How far does the evolutionary origin of species affect the current theological idea. This is usually designated as "special creation," and the author pertinently asks, "Whence came this idea?" After observing that neither science nor theology know anything of the ultimate origin of things, just as Genesis offers no interpretation of the origin of chaotic matter out of which the Universe was made, but only of secondary productions, he shows that while the current idea is practically "agnostic"—for to say that species were created by a Divine *fiat* is simply (as Darwin observes) a reverent way of saying, "It is what it is." "Evolution, on the other hand, at least attempts to bring God's action in the past in line with His action in the present; His creation of species with His creation of individuals." Just as the writer of our Church Catechism tacitly assumes this when he bids our children say, "I believe in God, who made me and all the world," in which the logical argument seems to be implied, "If I was not specially created, but evolved, neither was all the world." The author goes on to observe, "It is really time that the doctrine of special creations, which some theologians cling to so tenaciously, was held up to the light. Whence did it come from? Who invented it?" He shows that it was not held by St.

* January 18th, p. 91; January 25th, p. 126; February 1st, p. 162. The articles are not signed.

* See "An. and Pl. under Dom.," Vol. II., pp. 430 and 431.

† "Nature," Vol. XXXVI., p. 609.

Augustine, nor by the schoolmen, nor is it deducible from Genesis; for, in the first place, there is the distinct order—chaos, water, land, vegetation, marine “monsters,” birds, land animals and quadrupeds, and lastly man; an order as far as it goes, closely tallying with the discoveries of Palæontology. More than that, the repeated use of the imperative mood,—“Let there be a firmament,” “Let the water bring forth,” “Let the earth bring forth,” etc., is much more consonant with the action of secondary agents than with the theory of “special creations.” But the real source of the erroneous doctrine is Milton’s “Paradise Lost;” and it is a curious fact that while that poet is responsible for the idea becoming prevalent in the theological world and amongst the public generally, John Ray, the scientist, fixed the same idea in the scientific world at the same time. Whence Ray derived his notion is not clear, but Linnæus followed suit, so that between the two, or rather three, a general *consensus* of belief in special creations became fixed throughout the world.

The author concludes his first article by pointing out the gain theologians receive by adopting the evolutionary view of the origin of species. First in relieving them of the insuperable difficulty as to rudimentary organs, which are as abundant in man as in other animals and plants. Embryology then lends its powerful aid to the same belief. Secondly, “as a theory it is infinitely more Christian than the theory of ‘special creation.’ For it implies the immanence of God in nature, and the omnipresence of His creative power.” That is of Him in whom we and all the world live, move and have our being. The author finally sums up as follows:—“For Christians, the *facts of nature* are the *acts of God*. Religion relates these facts to God as their Author, science relates them to one another as integral parts of a visible order. . . . The religious view of the world is infinitely deepened and enriched when we not only recognise it as the work of God, but are able to trace the relation of part to part—to follow, if we may say it reverently, the steps by which God worked, to eliminate, so far as possible, from the action of Him ‘with Whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning,’ all that is arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable, and even where as yet we cannot explain to go on in faith and hope.”

GEORGE HENSLow.

A FOUR days’ Mission for members of the University of Cambridge was held last week; the Rev. H. Webb-Peploe, was the Missioner. He gave afternoon addresses in Holy Trinity Church on the “Spiritual Life,” and conducted Mission services in the Guildhall at night. The work began with a celebration of Holy Communion at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, at which Dr. Westcott gave a short address, and was concluded with a celebration at St. Benet’s Church.

THE GERALDINES.

“SHANID-ABO.”

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.

CHAPTER I.

THE reign of Elizabeth is memorable in the annals of Ireland. Irish discontent, smouldering for centuries, and breaking out occasionally in stormy broils, now assumed more formidable proportions, and took the form of organised rebellions, headed in Ulster by the chiefs of the Hy-Neill, and in Munster by the Geraldines.

The Geraldines were descendants of the powerful family of FitzGerald, one of whom came over with FitzStephen in the reign of Henry II.

Nesta bore three sons to Gerald of Windsor: William, father of Raymond le Gros; Maurice FitzGerald; and David, Bishop of St. David’s. Nesta was married a second time to Stephen, Constable of Cardigan, to whom she bore Robert FitzStephen. Giraldus Cambrensis belonged to the same family, being son of William de Barri, whose mother was daughter of Nesta.

It is an interesting feature of Irish history to trace the steps by which English settlers adopted Irish customs, until in process of time their descendants became leaders of Irish disaffection. In old times this was known as becoming “degenerate.”

During the reigns of Edward II. and Edward III. the English settlers in Munster, Connaught, Ulster, and in great part of Leinster, became degenerate, and instead of the English dress, language, and customs, adopted those of the Irish. The Burkes of Connaught, after the Red Earl’s death, called their chiefs Mac-William Eighter and MacWilliam Oughter. One family of the Geraldines became MacGibbon, whose chief was known as the White Knight. Desmond, after the Scottish war, adopted Irish customs, and took the lead among the degenerate nobles of the South. When Edward IV. married Elizabeth Grey, the Geraldine contemptuously called her “a tailor’s widow.” The taunt rankled, and he was accused of high treason on the charges of fostering an alliance with the Irish, and levying coyne and livery. He was condemned and executed.

At the time that Piers Gaveston was sent over as “Lord Lieutenant”—the first occasion when this title was given—the most powerful of the Anglo-Irish families was the house of De Burgh, whose head was Richard de Burgh, Earl of Ulster, well-known as “the Red Earl,” whose court held at Trim threw into the shade the tinsel pageantry of the representative of royalty. The Red Earl having engaged in hostilities with the Geraldines, was defeated, and agreed to an arrangement by which the two chiefs of that haughty line, Maurice and Thomas FitzJohn FitzGerald, married his two daughters. From this union sprang the two houses of Kildare and Desmond, representing from henceforth the two branches of the Geraldines.

A serious injury inflicted upon Ireland by Desmond was during the Scottish war, when, in imitation of the Irish tax known as Bonaght, he instituted Coyne and Livery, sassing his soldiers upon private houses. (See Davies, “True Discoverie,” p. 189; Leland, I., pp. 280-2.) The first earl was also the first Irish peer

who refused to attend a Parliament summoned by royal authority ; and he further weakened the English interest by exciting jealousy between the English by birth and the English by blood. A fierce, turbulent race, the Geraldines of Desmond from this time forward lived and died amid drawn swords. And the house of Kildare emulated their southern kinsmen in lawlessness and daring.

When the struggle between the two houses of York and Lancaster died out, one family, the house of Kildare, had become all powerful in Ireland. In the reigns of Edward V. and Richard III. no government could be carried on without the co-operation of the Earl of Kildare, and as he had given his sister in marriage to Con O'Neill, the young chieftain of the northern Hy-Neill, his influence when he was elected lord deputy threw that of the Crown into the shade. The Anglo-Irish in general had sided with the house of York, so that when Henry VII. ascended the throne Ireland became the principal asylum for all those who aspired to the crown or plotted against the government. Simnel, who personated Warwick, appeared in Dublin in 1486, and the Earl of Kildare at once declared in his favour, and had him crowned on Whit-Sunday, in Dublin, at Christ Church Cathedral. After Divine Service had concluded he was borne from the Cathedral to Dublin Castle, after the ancient Irish mode of inaugurating princes and chiefs, on the shoulders of Darcy of Platten, an Anglo-Irish chieftain of Meath.

Some of the Yorkist leaders advised that Simnel should not leave Ireland but fight out the contest for the throne on Irish soil. The counsels of those who recommended an expedition into England prevailed over this section, and while Kildare remained in Ireland to superintend the affairs of Government, the Earl of Lincoln led an army into England, June 1487, to support the cause of the pretender. Henry VII. lost no time in taking measures against the insurgents. On June 6th, 1487, the two armies met at Stoke in Nottinghamshire, where, in spite of inequality of numbers, a desperate battle was fought. Lincoln, Thomas and Maurice FitzGerald, Broughton, Plunket and many Anglo-Irish leaders fell on the field of battle, and Simnel, having been captured, was contemptuously relegated to the office of scullion in the kitchen of Henry. This conspiracy had hardly blown over when another claimant appeared in the person of Perkin Warbeck, who attempted to raise an Irish army for the same purpose as Simnel, but though Desmond joined his standard, he met but little encouragement in the island, which he soon abandoned for France, and his subsequent career does not belong to Irish history. In 1489 Henry summoned Kildare, Buttevant, Fermoy, Kinsale, Howth, Dunsany, and other barons to the court, remarking, "that unless they sometimes saw their king, they would place the crown on the head of an ape." While these quarrels distracted and weakened the English interest, the Irish chiefs carried on their petty feuds undisturbed. O'Neill and O'Donnell waged war with sword and pen. O'Neill thus worded his demand for tribute, "Send me tribute, or else—" To which the other replied, "I owe you none, and if—" But Henry's attention was now turned to Ireland, and he despatched as his deputy Sir Edward Poyning, a vigorous and capable man, who at once set about the task of reducing the country to order. The new viceroy called a parliament to meet in Drogheda, on the first Monday in December, 1495. It was destined to mark

a constitutional epoch in the annals of Ireland. The points aimed at in its deliberations were three. (1.) The relief of the people from the yoke of the lords. (2.) The prevention of degeneracy. (3.) The reformation of the Pale.

To abolish "Coyné and Livery," by which the land had been desolated, all irregular taxes were forbidden, and a land rate, payable to the king, was substituted. All statutes passed in England were made binding in Ireland, and it was further provided that no act should be proposed in any Irish parliament until it had first been transmitted to England for the approval of the king and his council. The English of the Pale were enjoined to practise archery. The statutes of Kilkenny were re-enacted, except those forbidding the use of the Irish language, and the custom of riding without saddles. An act of attainder was passed against the Geraldines, and Kildare was sent a prisoner to England.

Of the enactments passed in this parliament the two most memorable were :

(1.) That which established the force in Ireland of all statutes previously passed in England.

(2.) That the acts to be submitted to an Irish parliament should first be transmitted for approval to the king and his council.

Kildare remained in confinement in England, and his enemies exerted themselves to excite against him the jealousy of Henry, but when the earl was admitted to the royal presence, his blunt, straightforward manner and confident demeanour won the favour of the sovereign. Henry warned him to prepare his defence and secure good counsel, as he would certainly need it. "Yea," cried Kildare, "the ablest in the realm ;" and seizing Henry by the hand, "Your Highness I take for my counsel against those false knaves." The subtle flattery was not displeasing to the king, and his favour was still more won to the cause of the Irish noble when he discovered that many of the charges urged against him were of a petty nature, the result of private spite. He was accused amongst other things of having burned the church of Cashel to the ground. "Spare your evidence," said the earl, "I did set fire to the church, but then I thought the bishop was in it." The accusers closed their complaints by saying, "All Ireland cannot govern the Earl of Kildare." "Then," replied Henry, "the Earl of Kildare shall govern all Ireland." And with a strong hand the Geraldine ruled the country. In 1504, at Knocktow, near Galway, he defeated the MacWilliam of Clanrickarde, head of the Galway Burkes, aided by O'Brien, lord of Thomond, the O'Carrolls, MacNamaras, and O'Connors, and put to the sword nine thousand of their followers. This terrible blow broke the power of the southern septs for many a year. Kildare died September 3rd, 1513.

(To be continued.)

THE *Morning Post* states that the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's have appointed Dr. G. C. Martin, in succession to Dr. Stainer, as organist. Dr. Martin has for many years been master of the children of the choir, and the efficiency of the work done by the boys is due to his earnest exertions. As an accompanist and solo player Dr. Martin has given many proofs of his ability, and his compositions for the service of the Church show him to be one of the best among modern English Church composers.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE BREAD WHICH CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN.

SIR,—I thank "Medicus" for his letter, though his last sentence is not very plain. But Mr. Lawrence, according to Pearson, has fallen into downright heresy. He says that our Lord's Body came down from heaven. See Pearson, Art. III., page 243. "As He was made of the substance of the Virgin, so was He not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget Him by any communication of His essence, therefore He is not the Father of Him, though He was conceived by Him."

"The Socinians, who will acknowledge no other way, before Christ's conception, by which He could be the only-begotten Son of God, have been forced to invent a strange conjunction in the nature of Christ; one part received from the Virgin, and so consequently from David and from Abraham, from whom that Virgin did descend, another formed by the spirit, and conjoined with it, by the one part of which humanity He was the Son of Man, as by the other He was the Son of God." "Ascended up where He was before," refers to His Divine nature, as does the other, "the Son of Man, which is in heaven." Of course, Mr. Lawrence did not mean to speak heresy. He disclaims "dogmatising" on a subject whereon opinions differ. But this is not an open question. Offhand statements are very dangerous on abstruse matters, which have been decided, as Pearson shows in the earliest ages. The idea of our Lord's Body having come down, because of His being conceived by the Holy Ghost, is so startling, that one would have thought that no cautious man, scholar or not, would throw it out in this offhand manner. I have spent much time over Mr. Lawrence's letter, trying to realise what his ideas are. I can find nothing tantamount to it in any of the theories, ancient or modern, which Pearson exposes. But I have come to the conclusion that his idea is that the Holy Ghost brought something from heaven, and imparted it to the Virgin. How this theory is reconcilable with our Lord's Body being born of the Virgin is past my powers of comprehension. If I wrong Mr. Lawrence, I shall be very sorry, and shall be only too happy to retract and apologise.

INQUIRENS.

BURIAL REFORM.—A meeting was recently held at Margate under the auspices of the Burial Reform Association, to which Dr. Rowe addressed some very timely remarks upon the desirability of an alteration in the present system of burial. Dr. Rowe once more pointed out that the decomposition of the body after death is, when viewed from the chemical standpoint, always a combustion, and he admitted the logical consequence—namely, that the most perfect, rapid, and elegant form of combustion was cremation. The "earth-to-earth" system advocated by Mr. Seymour Haden, where the body is placed in a coffin of stout millboard, which rapidly decays, and permits the

products of animal decomposition to pass directly into the surrounding earth, is undoubtedly a distinct advance upon the system still prevalent of burying in leaden or stout wooden coffins of many casings, which have the effect of retarding disintegration, and lead consequently to a storing up of huge aggregations of human remains in every stage of decay. Such a system is not consonant with reason, and the Bishop of London has declared it to be "inconsistent with the principles of the Christian faith"; it cannot therefore be defended upon any other ground than an unreasoning acquiescence in a comparatively modern and most unhygienic custom. The Burial Reform Association, of which the Rev. F. Lawrence, Westow Vicarage, York, is the Honorary Secretary, advocates early interment, and the use of perishable coffins to permit rapid disintegration after burial in the earth. As to the first, there can be no room for difference of opinion; and as to the second, those who are unwilling to carry the matter to its logical conclusion may fairly be asked to resort to this system, to which the term "Eremacausis" has been applied. A conference will be held by the society in the Portman Rooms, Baker Street, on February 23rd, at 3.15 p.m., in which Sir Edward Sieveking, Dr. B. W. Richardson, F.R.S., Dr. Septimus Gibbon, the Hon. Dudley Fortescue, and Dr. Danford Thomas will take part. Medical officers of health and other persons interested in burial, funeral, and mourning reform are invited to be present.—*British Medical Journal*.

AT the invitation of Canon Christopher, about 300 members of the University of Oxford were present at the Church Missionary Society's breakfast on Saturday at the Clarendon Hotel. An address was delivered by the Rev. F. E. Wigram, Trinity, Cambridge, hon. secretary of the society, who had recently visited the Missions of the society in India, China, Japan, and North West America. Canon Ince, in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. Wigram for his address, said he looked upon this annual breakfast as a very remarkable gathering, for it brought together old and young and men of various views, who perhaps might not altogether approach Church questions and ecclesiastical questions from the same point of view, and who retained their views on Church policy and the like, but all heartily came together out of regard and respect for their kind-hearted host, whose energetic and indefatigable labours in Oxford for the last quarter of a century they all admired; but still with the higher and deeper view of their meeting together to further the cause of Missions.

THE third series of Sunday evening lectures on "Church Doctrine" is being delivered in Great St. Mary's, Cambridge, and though not so well attended as the first series they attract a much better congregation than gathered to hear those that were delivered last winter. The course opened with an historical lecture on the Christian ministry, in which Mr. Stanton contrived to compress a wonderful amount of positive statement on the early history of the organisations of the Church, while indicating the weak points in the theories of Dr. Hatch and Dr. Harnack. Last Sunday Mr. Wood, the vicar of St. Clement's, lectured on the "Priesthood of our Lord"; he is a new recruit who has joined the lecturers for the first time this year, and those who listened to his clear statement of theological truths must have felt that he adds a great deal of strength to the coadjutors who have been working hitherto.

THE offertory for the "Old Schools," after the Bishop of Chester's first sermon amounted to £36. The schools of Cambridge are excellently conducted and obtain capital reports from the inspectors; the teaching is thoroughly good, but they are somewhat hampered for want of funds. Hitherto the committee have been able to go on providing increased accommodation as the town developed, but many of the schools are inadequately furnished with appliances, and few enjoy any of the luxuries of modern elementary education. The run of married fellows are less able to subscribe for the support of these schools (in some cases less willing) than their predecessors were, and the future of the schools causes the committee some anxiety. To allow them to go down, and be handed over to a school board, would be most short-sighted on the part of members of the University, as the rates would be a serious charge both on college property and on the householder, and there can be no doubt that a really good education is being furnished by the voluntary schools at far less expense to the residents than would be the case if a board were established here.

ON Saturday last the Bishop of London consecrated the new church of St. James's, West Hampstead, of which the Rev. Charles M'Anally is the vicar-designate. The building, which is in Early English style, was designed by Mr. A. Blomfield, and has been erected at a cost of £10,000, of which £2,000 was contributed by Mr. James Lafontaine. Mr. Lafontaine has also at his own expense fitted up the handsome chancel screen and organ. The church, which is intended to accommodate a thousand persons, has no endowment, and will have to minister to the spiritual requirements of a large population, the majority of whom are in poor circumstances and cannot be expected to contribute largely to its support.

AT St. Alphage, London Wall, a course of Lent lectures will be preached on Friday evenings at 7.30 p.m. The preachers in succession will be—Canon Elwyn, Prebendary Forrest, D.D., Bishop Walsham How, Archdeacon Hessey, Dr. Stokoe, Canon Fleming, and Prebendary Barker. On Good Friday evening a selection from Dr. Stainer's "Crucifixion" will be sung by the choir after the service. Young men are invited to attend.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alcock, Rev. John Price, M.A., Rector of Crayford, Kent.
 Baydon, Rev. J. W., M.A., Rector of Partney; Rector of Low Toynnton, Lincolnshire.
 Brameld, Rev. W. A., Principal of St. Paul's Mission House, Burgh; Prebendary of North Kelsey, in Lincoln Cathedral.
 Cooper, Rev. T. J., Vicar of Dalston, Cumberland, Honorary Canon of Carlisle Cathedral; Vicar of Grange-over-Sands, Carnforth.
 Cruddas, Rev. William Sandwith, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Laniwet, Cornwall.
 Day, Rev. Archibald, M.A., Curate of Sevenoaks; Vicar of St. Matthias's, Malvern Link.
 Denison, Rev. Joseph Glasson, M.A., Incumbent of All Saints', Heaton Norris.
 Gedge, Rev. Edmund, Vicar of Aldsworth; Perpetual Curate of Cleeton St. Mary, Shropshire.
 Gepp, Rev. Charles Gee, M.A., Vicar of Badsey and Vicar of Wickhamford, Worcestershire.
 Hadden, Rev. Robert Henry, B.A., Curate of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate; Vicar of St. Botolph's - without - Aldgate, London.

Hayne, Rev. R. J., Vicar of Buckland Monachorum; Chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter.
 Hills, Rev. William Jefferys, M.A., Rector of Newbold-upon-Stour, Worcestershire.
 Holroyde, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of Stapleford, Notts.
 Hullah, Rev. T., Rector of Calstock and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Truro Cathedral.
 Humphrey, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Vicar of Caton-with-Littledeale.
 James, Rev. G., Rector of St. Michael's and Rector of St. Aldate's, Gloucestershire.
 Jones, Rev. Edward E., B.A., Vicar of Denton-in-Wharfedale, Vicar of Heckmondwike, near Todmorden.
 King, Rev. Henry Stuart, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Tatworth, Somersetshire.
 Knollys, Rev. Erskine William, M.A., Rector of Great Chart; Vicar of St. Mark's, South Norwood, Surrey.
 Kyngdon, Rev. George Theodosius Boughton, M.A., Rector of St. Michael's, Caerhays; Vicar of St. Winnow, Cornwall.
 Lambrick, Rev. Samuel Stratford, B.A., Vicar of South Muskharn, Notts.
 Leeke, Rev. Chancellor, Chaplain of the Lincoln County Hospital.
 Longden, Rev. William George, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, South Norwood; Rector of Great Chart, Kent.
 Marriott, Rev. Randolph Charles, M.A., Chaplain of the Dorset County Hospital.
 McLaughlin, Rev. Edward Crofton Leigh, Rector of Burford (Third Portion), Shropshire.
 Moore, Rev. J. H., A.K.C., late Curate of Bicester, Oxon; Curate-in-Charge of Fawcett, Oxon.
 Oliver, Rev. James, M.A., Curate (Sole Charge) of Croston, Lancashire.
 Phillips, Rev. Henry Gray, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Felton Commonhill, Bristol.
 Rees, Rev. William, Curate of St. Mark's, Newport; Perpetual Curate of Llangovan-with-Penyclawdd.
 Sneepe, Rev. Maitland Edward, Vicar of Lyneham, Wilts.
 Sylvester, Rev. Edward T., Rector of Deene, Wansford; Rural Dean of Oundle, Second Deanry.
 Taunton, Rev. Charles William Sackville, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Veep, Cornwall.
 Taylor, Rev. Edward Francis, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Truro.
 Ubank, Rev. John, Vicar of Christ Church, Cockermouth; Rector of Bolton, Cumberland.
 Wakefield, Rev. Henry Russell, Vicar of Sandgate, Kent.
 Weir, Rev. J., Vicar of Thurlby near Bourn, Lincolnshire.
 Williams, Rev. John W., Vicar of St. Mary's, Widnes, Warrington; Vicar of Rainford, Lancashire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brock-Arnold, Rev. George Moss, M.A., Hertford College, Oxford, Chaplain of the Camberwell Workhouse, at 15, Brunswick Square, Camberwell, on the 3rd inst.
 Cockerell, Rev. George William, M.A., Oxon, for thirty-five years Vicar of Coonibe and Kingston Vale, at the Beeches, Roehampton, on the 14th inst.
 Evans, Rev. Thomas, M.A., at Broughton Rectory, Skipton-in-Craven, on the 5th inst., aged 56 years.
 Low, Rev. John Low, M.A., Vicar of Wittonstall and Honorary Canon of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, at Wittonstall Vicarage, on the 8th inst., aged 71.
 Midwinter, Rev. N., M.A., thirteen years Vicar of the Parish and formerly Rector of St. Michael's, Winchester, at Bleasby Vicarage, on the 7th inst., aged 71.
 Porter, Rev. John Leech, twenty years Vicar of the Parish, at St. John's Vicarage, Ladywood, Birmingham, on the 11th inst., aged 53.
 Raban, Rev. Francis William, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Langford-Budville, Wellington, in London, on the 10th inst., aged 35.
 Story, Rev. William, of Corick, Clogher, Co. Tyrone, sometime Rector of Aghaboy, co. Monaghan, at 24, Lower Baggot Street, Dublin, on the 9th inst., aged 83.
 Wright, Rev. Richard Franklin, M.A., for thirty years Vicar of Wrangle, on the 8th inst., aged 68.
 Wynne-Jones, the Ven. John, Vicar of Bodedern, Anglesea, and late Archdeacon of Bangor, at Chester, on the 8th inst., aged 83.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE GREAT VOICE FROM HEAVEN.

BY THE REV. J. LIGHTFOOT, M.A., D.SC., VICAR
OF CROSS-STONE, TODMORDEN.

SERMON PREACHED AT CROSS-STONE, ON SUNDAY,
JANUARY 22ND, 1888.

"And they heard a great voice from Heaven, saying unto them, Come up hither."—REV. xi. 12.

TWO voices are ever speaking to the soul of man, and it is of all importance to each of us to which of these voices we give heed. The one invites us to things which seem pleasant and near, the other to things which seem far off and hard. The one whispers to us to do what we like, the other bids us do what we ought. The one tells of pleasures near at hand, and bids us take our fill and never heed the reckoning; the other falls upon our ear, grave and solemn, as from some toilsome height, saying, "Come up hither."

And our hearts tell us that this voice is the one which alone we ought to heed—that to listen to the other is ruinous and fatal—and yet, alas! how few choose the better part, how few heed the great invitation, whilst, on the other hand, how many give ear to the voice of the world, the flesh and the devil, and so make shipwreck of all that is fair and noble within them.

The voice of the world—have you heard it? It says, "Come unto me." It promises you to make the best of your life. It says to you: "Never heed what shall be hereafter; sit down to the banquet, eat your fill, and let the reckoning take thought for itself. Don't trouble about principle, think about popularity; you shout with the crowd, never mind what the crowd shouts. Is this man a little richer than you, possessing a little more social distinction? Hang on to him. Is this man your superior in spiritual grace? Ah, but he is poor. He can't help you on in the race of life. Shirk, cut him. Does duty and advantage clash? You think of yourself. Are you appealed to for a needful charity? Remember charity begins at home. Are you invited to assist in some struggling effort for God? Your business claims your whole time. Seek out the very pleasantest path you can, shirk every duty you can. Leave God, and duty, and your soul, and eternity to care for themselves as best they can. Set up far on high *my* pleasure, *my* indolence, *my* bank book, *my* health, *my* worldly

welfare, and down on your bended knees say out, 'These be thy Gods.'" Have you heard the voice of the world? Let the empty pew in church, the neglected Bible, the hasty or altogether forgotten prayer,—let these answer.

And the voice of the flesh—Have you heard it? It too says, "Come hither," and ye shall find joy. Have you heard it? It bids you drown dull care in drink; it comes to tickle your ear with the unclean jest, it fires your imagination with unholy desire. How can we speak of the deadly whisper of impurity? Have you heard it? Let the cast-down look that dare not meet a parent's anxious gaze, let the hand that totters in early youth, let the heart that is seared, so that it cannot feel a true attachment, let the ruined reputation,—ah, let these answer.

And the voice of the devil—Have you heard that? It tells you the readiest way to get on, it bids you play fast and loose with the truth. "Do you know a man with one fault? proclaim it on the house-top. Do you know his many virtues? never speak of them. Have you heard the latest scandal? spread it abroad, add to it. Is there a book or a play which scoffs at virtue, go to see that play or read that book. Put the worst construction on everything, never believe but that under every good deed there is a bad motive. Believe the worst of all men." Have you heard the devil's voice? Let the hatreds, the misunderstandings, the unjust suspicions,—so common all around,—let these answer.

Ah, brethren, these voices we hear, nay, we must hear them, but God give you grace to turn from them.

When the world whispers, remember that voice which said, "What shall it profit if you gain the whole world and lose your own soul."

When the whisper of impurity is heard, think of that voice that said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

When the voice of the devil is heard, say in the strength of the Saviour, "Get thee behind me, Satan."

The world, the flesh and the devil will swagger along the street arm in arm, and many, alas! will eagerly follow in their train. But to-day, in this sacred place, we will meditate upon other voices which bid us to better things. The voice that calls us to the better life is not a loud one; and those who are too engrossed with other things may never hear it at all. It speaks not to the outward ear, but all the more solemnly in the heart, it speaks plainest in our quiet, thoughtful hours, and when we lie wakeful upon our pillow at night. Dear brethren, if you have not observed the voice heretofore, listen to me whilst I try to articulate its utterances to you.

The voice that says to you, "Come up hither," is the voice of the great God. He bids you set your affection on things above. Can you not in-

terpret that stamp of vanity which is so indelibly impressed upon all earthly things. Why is it that the heart of man refuses to rest content with the toys of this world, why is it that every rose has its thorn, every blessing its canker, why do our happiest feelings so soon pass away, why does death come into our family circle, why do our hearts so often fail us? It is in these ways God is saying solemnly to our souls, "Come up hither," where anguish is never felt, and friends are never parted.*

And that voice which speaks to us in the details of our daily life, speaks yet more plainly in God's Word. In the warnings of the law, in the exhortation of the prophets, in the sweet invitation of the Gospels. These, the whole Bible, is the echo of God's great voice from heaven, saying, "Come up hither." It is the long-suffering and mercy of God which calleth men to repentance, of God who willeth not that any should perish, that all should forsake their wickedness and live, that the wicked should forsake His way, and the unrighteous man his thought, and return into the Lord, that He may have mercy upon him, and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon.

And not only is it the voice of God that thus speaks to us—it is also the voice of God's servants, those friends and relations who have fallen asleep in Jesus, and gone before us from this world. There are few indeed who have lived long in this world who have not stood by the bed of the dying, and I hope many of you have seen a true Christian friend or brother depart, have looked upon such a one as their life ebbed away, but not their love, as the eye of sense grew dim, but that of faith waxed brighter and brighter. Any death-bed is solemn, that of an ungodly person is painful to the extreme. I cannot understand how it is that relatives who stand by such can ever forget it. I am utterly astounded how, before they have ceased to wear mourning, the lessons are forgotten. But far, far different is the death-bed of the just. It is a blessed privilege to stand by such, and to hear such, while whispering you farewell, bid you so to live that death should only bring you to where they are gone, where death shall be no more, and as you felt the pressure of the hand which was growing cold, and saw the earnest spirit that shone through those glazing eyes, would he not be a hopeless one who would not at such a moment resolve and promise that, God helping you, you would. Dear brethren, though death has sealed those lips that voice is speaking yet, that heart cares for you yet, that soul is remembering those last words it spoke to you yet. From above the voice says to you, "Come up hither." The way is steep, the ascent is toilsome, but they trod it, and now they enjoy the rest that remaineth after

the toil is past. Other paths offer you pleasure, this offers you blessedness. Other paths offer you wealth and success, this offers you content and nobility. Other paths offer you a tiring excitement, this offers you peace.

I like to see a man standing quietly by an old grave-stone. I like, especially on Easter-day, to see a child or an aged person placing a little cross of flowers upon the grave of some loved one. The worldly may look upon it as a waste of money. The narrow-minded will call it superstition, but never heed that; those who so say are to be pitied, they have such poor, dwarfed natures, they cannot feel the sweeter side of life; they are too coarse and vulgar. You go, dear brethren, and take, or if you cannot take, send once a year, your little flower, and as you stand there in that still spot, where worldly cares do not come, and griefs no longer vex, then somehow the sounds of the world will melt away, and its push and its hurry will look so little. Ah, brethren, say your little prayer there, never you mind the carping little minds who will call it weakness and fancy. You will know better than that; you will hear the old voice of old, which will comfort and encourage you on your pilgrim way. A great voice from heaven will fall on your soul, saying, "Come up hither."

And so, dear brethren, day by day the chorus of voices from above bidding us Come up hither is increasing.

In a few minutes the preacher's voice will be hushed, and we shall pass without these sacred walls, and many will forget what we have meditated upon, amid the flow of light conversation and the careless jest.

Sunday after Sunday your preachers try to arouse your attention and awaken your interest. It would be transparent hypocrisy if we ignored the fact that by some who attend here—amid much personal kindness—our words are lightly regarded, and form but the subject for an easy criticism or a passing comment. Sometimes one is apt to be disheartened. But the Spirit of God, I pray, may do that in your hearts which our words are unable to effect.

But though we have witnessed to it so often before, let your preacher bear witness to the truth again, that there is another voice calling you, and that is the voice of Jesus from the Cross. "Come up hither," say the other voices, "this one tells you how you may." Even as the heart looks up to obey the gracious invitation, it finds not power to do it.

The while I fain would tread the heavenly way,
Evil is ever with me day by day.

I am fettered and bound down with the chain of my sins. Evil has become second nature with me. Oh, break the chain, cast off the load, and we will try to creep on. Will you? Then hear the voice

* The reader acquainted with Dr. Boyd's excellent "Graver Thoughts" will recognise several thoughts here.

which speaks forgiveness for the past, which gives you grace and aid when you are weak, which to the vilest and most frivolous, to the worldly and most sin-stained, to the unclean, to the most selfish—to all whose characters are blighted with sin, whose hearts are eaten out with care—the gracious invitation still comes, “Come up hither.”

It is the voice of Jesus that I hear,
His are the hands outstretched to draw me near,
And His the Blood that can for me atone,
And set me faultless there before the Throne.

O Great Absolver, grant my soul may wear
The lowliest garb of penitence and prayer.
That in Thy courts my glorious dress,
May be the garment of Thy righteousness.

THE NEW HEAVEN AND NEW EARTH.

BY THE REV. E. HERBERT JONES, M.A.,
VICAR OF ROLVENDEN, KENT.

SERMON PREACHED IN ROLVENDEN CHURCH, ON
SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY, 1888.

“And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away.”—REVELATION xxi. 1.

THE Bible begins with the creation of the world, it ends with this prophecy of the coming of a better earth and heaven. And on this Septuagesima Sunday, when in beginning again our yearly course of Sunday lessons we read the 1st chapter of Genesis, which tells us how God created all the things that are; and how, creating them, He beheld all that He created, and saw that it was good; we read also this chapter from the Revelation, which teaches us to look forward to a time when this present world shall have passed away.

From the very beginning this truth, that the earth as it now exists is not for ever, was shadowed forth by God through the works which He created and made, so that that which is here and elsewhere told us by revelation of God might be learned, imperfectly indeed, but still surely, from the study of the visible creation. For, as St. Paul points out in writing to the Hebrews, “that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.” And from the very beginning the visible creation bore this mark of change, and as soon as things had any existence they began to wax old, and the signal of decay was impressed upon them.

Thus it does not even require the study of the stars and of the rocks to tell us that the present order of things cannot last for ever. The whole aspect of creation shows us a fierce struggle going on between life and death, between progress and decay; and although for a time, in the fresh burst of youthful vigour, the forces of decay and death may seem to be beaten back and vanquished, yet

after a while, as the years or the ages pass on, the forces of decay assert their power, and even the longest lived of things comes to an end. And this perpetual growing old and decaying of all that is brightest and best in this world appeals more strongly to the mind of men than even the continual re-assertion of the power of life, in the constant re-appearance of new forms of youth, as that which has become old passes away. And this no doubt because man feels in himself that he too is growing old, he clings with a passionate tenderness to those things which have linked themselves with his youth; and as these one by one grow old and pass away, it seems to him that all things are changing for the worse, and that the world is growing old with him. Thus we find old people complaining that people and things are not what they were when they were young, that everything is inferior now to what it was then, and that soon there will be little that is good left upon the earth.

Now, without touching the question as to whether things may really be growing better or worse, it is certain that much of this complaining arises from the fact that the one who complains is himself growing old, and looks at things in a different light to what he did when he was young. For then, with a lifetime in front of him, and his youthful vigour unimpaired, everything seemed to speak to him with the voice of hope; things were growing old, then, as they are now, but he did not notice them, and when they passed away he perhaps thought it a good thing; for he only remembered them as old, and it scarcely came into his mind that once they were young too. But now he sees things growing old that were young with him; and the advent of new things, instead of giving him fresh hope as they did when he was young, only help to make it more evident that the order of things to which he belongs is passing away, and that soon, if he be left at all, it will be as one whose age has gone by, and whose place knows him no more. Thus it is but natural that he should look back to the times that are gone, and, remembering the sunshine of his youthful days, when his young life beat strong within him, speak of those days as better than those which now are.

And so mankind, in bygone ages, listening to these complaints of aged men, and not perceiving what lay at the root of this praising of the times that were gone, came to suppose that the former times were always better than the present, and thus they fashioned the story of a golden age, when everything was good, and every virtue flourished on the earth; and told how this golden age was succeeded by a silver age, in which things were not so good as in the age of gold, but, still, better than in the iron age in which they themselves lived.

Now it is clear that this theory lands us in a very hopeless state. For if things and people are

ever growing worse and never better, what will be the end? And if we ourselves keep growing worse instead of better, what will be the end of us?

And yet we see how easy it is for any one who looks only at the outside of things to suppose that things are thus going from bad to worse. But if we take a broader view, refusing to look only at one particular object or country or time, and casting our eyes over the whole of God's creation, and marking the progress of His work in many ages, we shall find how it is true that He is ever bringing life out of death, and ever bringing in that which is new, as that which is old passes away.

And thus, even from the analogy of nature, we might be led to believe that just as the constant growing old and passing away of all that is on the earth points to the truth that the world itself is growing old, and will at last pass away; so, too, the constant evolution of the new from the old, the constant springing forth of new life as the shadow of death passes over that which is old, points us to the truth, which is revealed to us in this verse of the Revelation of St. John, that when this world of change and decay shall at length have fulfilled its own prophecy, and like all that is upon it have grown old and passed away, that then from the ashes of the old, as it were, God will bring a new heaven and a new earth, a heaven and earth in which these forces of decay and death shall have no place, where all that saddens and spoils the perfection of our life in this world shall have passed away with the world itself, and when all things shall be for ever new. Thus the truth which God would have us learn from beholding the law of change at work in His world, and from studying the constant growing old of things, is not that God's order of things grows worse as it advances, but that the decay of that which is growing old will be the preparation for the birth of something better. And therefore the signs of change and decay which we observe around us will cease to be occasions for bewailing what is past, and become the bright harbinger of a better day to come. And not only so, but the very beauties and excellencies of our present world become by this means prophetic of the glories which shall surround that new heaven and new earth, which shall be the heritage of the risen Church.

And if God, on looking upon the completion of the visible creation, pronounced it to be very good, which creation with all its goodnesses was soon to wax old and pass away, how much more will He, think you, pronounce very good that new heaven and new earth where change and decay shall no longer have a place, and where nothing shall wax old or lose its freshness. And therefore we have no excuse, as Christians, for idly bewailing what is past; it is rather our duty to look forward than backward. For no good comes of

bewailing the times that are gone; it can only make us unhappy, and leads to no improvement in the present. But if, instead of looking backward for our golden age, we look forward for it; if we learn that it is the law of God that the better should succeed the worse, and not the worse the better; if we look upon the present order of things as a preparation for a more perfect order hereafter, and not the survival of a more perfect state of things gone by—then will the real importance of the present appear, and we shall be no longer tempted to let our hands fall idly by our side, as though all work were useless in a world that is rushing to decay. But the signs which tell us that the world is growing old, will be signs to us that a new order of things is coming on, and that it behoves us to make such use of the present that we may be ready to take our place in that better order of things, when it appears.

For as in this present world we see that the new grows out of the old, and that there is no break in the chain of creation, but that that which goes before ministers to that which comes after, so will it be with that for which this world is a preparation; this present world contains as it were the seed, from which that other world will grow; and our life here contains the germ, which will develop into that higher life of the world to come. And therefore, even in ourselves we ought to be able to trace some tokens of the change from worse to better; and with a cheerful heart to press forward in the pathway of amendment; knowing that our labour will not be thrown away, and that the end, to which we are hastening or being hastened, together with all things in this world, is not an end of destruction, of broken promises, and of shattered hopes, but the dawning of a day of resurrection, when that perfection, so often foreshadowed and striven after now, shall be at length attained; and when those advances, apparently so often checked, will triumph over all the forces which restrained them; and the life which seemed to be wasted or thrown away shall be found to be full of immortality.

Thus the true lesson which creation teaches us is that of hope; a hope which tells us that if the present be bright, the future will be still more bright; and that the lengthening shadows, which mark the close of this day, are but the necessary forerunners of the dawn of another and more glorious day. If there was no disappointment here, if all our hopes were fulfilled, and nothing grew old or yielded to decay, then indeed should we have no promise of a better world to come.

But now each disappointment, each finger-mark of time, is but a reminder bidding us look forward, and telling us of the coming of that day, when we too shall see the new heaven and the new earth, and when the first heaven and the first earth shall have passed away.

FAILING OF THE GRACE OF GOD.

BY THE LATE REV. EDWARD MEADE, RECTOR
OF WINKFIELD, WILTS, AND CANON OF SARUM.

SERMON PREACHED ON THE 24TH OCTOBER, 1886.

“Looking diligently, lest any man fail of the grace of God.”—HEBREWS xii. 15.

IT is the grace of God which bringeth salvation, and which, when the sun of righteousness arose, appeared unto men, for this is the light which, by coming into the world, lighteneth every man. It is this grace, or free favour of God, which supplies all the links of the chain from election, which is called the “election of grace,” to *glory* in the end. It is this grace of God by which the spiritually blind receive their sight, and which giveth understanding to the simple. It is this grace by which the conscience is convinced of sin, and by which the heart is filled with love to Christ Jesus as the great sin-bearer, by which the work of holiness is begun and carried on and made complete, and by which the believer is supported in all trials, and “kept through faith unto *salvation*.” This grace of God is, therefore, the very foundation of all our hopes as sinners; by the power of it the worst rebel may be reconciled and saved, but in the failure of this the anchor of the soul is lost, and the soul drifts away, until it is cast upon the shore of eternity, a hopeless wreck—and of this grace it is only too possible, as we have seen, to fail. Many despise it; many trifle with it; many take no pains to secure it. They would fain arrive at the journey’s end, but they are too idle, spiritually, to take the means. They will neither walk nor ride. There is the Bible, there is prayer, there is the house of God and His day, and there is the sacrament of our redemption; but these, and all the *means* of grace they either feebly use or *occasionally* attend, or else for considerable seasons they wholly neglect. Well, brethren, if the grace of God means so much, and if to fail of it be so awful a possibility, so true a danger, then ought we not, in all reason, for our dearest interests, as well as for duty’s sake, to listen with grave attention to the Apostle’s admonition, and “*look* diligently, lest any man fail of the *grace* of God.”

It remains to consider how this may be done. It is in one word, “looking diligently.” The word so rendered signifies to look at an object as a marksman would look at a mark which he desires to strike, *i.e.*, with close and earnest attention. The same word is applied by St. Peter to the ministerial office, where he exhorts the elders to feed the flock of God which is among them, “taking the *oversight* thereof, *i.e.*, directing their view with earnest attention, and it is likewise used to signify the successors of the Apostles, who are called *bishops*, or overseers, because it is their office

especially to take the oversight of the flock of God, each in his own diocese, *i.e.*, to look diligently to the supply of their spiritual need, and that in doctrine and conduct of life they take no harm. Remembering this force and significance of the word, we may more fully comprehend the meaning of the counsel or exhortation of the Apostle, “Looking diligently, lest any man fail of the grace of God.”

First, then, the view is to be directed to the mark aimed at;—this grace of God, which it is so great and crowning a mercy to possess, and so tremendous and irreparable a loss if any man fail of it. If we would not incur this failure, it is especially needful that we rightly value the *treasure*. Consider how it comes to be *within our reach*. It is the purchase of the precious blood of Jesus Christ, our Saviour. Apart from Christ Jesus and His work the *law* stands against the sinner in all its rigour, and the law must have its course, even to the exacting of the uttermost farthing, even to the infliction of eternal *penalties*, the worm, the fire. And where the law holds in its force there is *justice*, but not *grace*. “This do, and thou shalt live.” “The soul that sinneth, it shall die,” and “Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the law to do them.” It required all the marvellous work, the agonising sufferings, and the death of the Son of God who came down from heaven, in order to change the condition of the sinner, and to transfer him from the *law* to the grace of God. By the coming and the accomplished work of Jesus Christ it results that God can be just, and yet the justifier of every sinner, however sin-stained and however rebellious he may have been, provided only he lay hold, by a true faith, of the hope set before him in the Gospel, and provided he may be described as a sinner that believeth. If, therefore, you would not fail of the grace of God, consider the preciousness of that treasure, estimated at the enormous price at which it was purchased. The freedom of Rome was often sold for money in the time of St. Paul, of which the chief captain’s case was an example; “With a great sum obtained I this freedom;” but the freedom of the new Jerusalem, into which, by this grace of God, we are admitted freely at our baptism, has been redeemed for us by “no corruptible things,” though esteemed most highly, but “with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish, and without spot.” View the mark set before you in this light; estimate its value by its cost, and this is one great and most necessary method of compliance with the Apostle’s direction or exhortation, “looking diligently, lest any man fail of the grace of God.”

2. It is, in the next place, of the greatest moment that we realise the value of this grace to *ourselves*. It is not only in its own nature most precious, but it is most necessary for *us* to have it. We may visit a collection of paintings, and works of art may be again and again pointed out to us, as to which

we may be correctly informed that a price has been actually paid of many thousands of pounds; but we retire to our humbler houses, and we are happy without them. In the exhibition of rare and wonderful things a jewel may be exhibited, and of that we shall be told that, owing to its singular excellence and beauty, and its peculiar rarity, it exceeds computation by money, and that no price can be named as the measure of its value. Be it so; we can take our view of this inestimable treasure; we can gaze with admiration on its size and splendour; but we can go our way afterwards without a single feeling of regret that we do not possess it, and with a full consciousness that our happiness is in no way affected, much less destroyed, because we cannot make or call that jewel our own. It is far otherwise with this grand object, "the grace of God." If we are to have joy and peace, nay, if we are to have safety for our souls, the grace of God must be our very own; nay, there is no true life without it. We must have it to be secure, and we must be *conscious* that we have it, or we can only live in the midst of awful mysteries in presumptuous blindness, or as wanderers in the labyrinth of this world, bewildered, and forlorn. We must stand in this grace of God, or we have no foundation of hope, and we must *know* that we so stand, or we can have no sprinkled conscience, and no peace.

Thirdly—keeping our view, then, firmly and habitually fixed on these two points, the *real* value of this grace of God and its *indispensable necessity* for ourselves, we must also take into, and keep steadily in view the hindrances and the helps in our way. We confess that we are "sore let and hindered in running the race that is set before us." We must well consider what these hindrances may be, and this we must do each one for himself; otherwise we are open to dangerous error. We may, for example, discern correctly how such a one, with whom we are familiar, is falling short, or falling away from this grace of God by his un-governed passions, by a false tongue, or by selfish indulgence; how another is embarrassed, and perhaps cast out of the barriers of the course by his love of money and ambition to prosper in the world; or how another comes behind through envy of those above him in the scale of life and through murmuring at his lot; and, because we are not conscious of these particular hindrances in ourselves we may congratulate ourselves upon liberty and cry peace, while we are overlaid by some unsuspected weight, and fast tied and bound by the chain of some easily-besetting sin. Look diligently to find and to overcome the hindrance in yourselves, "lest any man fail of the grace of God."

Lastly, we must consider carefully, and diligently use all the helps provided. If we would stand in the grace of God, we must use the *means* of grace. We must be as punctual in our times of private prayer and home worship, in our searching of the

word of God and in our *public* opportunities, as diligent to improve the occasions of hearing the word, of worshipping in the house of prayer, and in receiving Christ Jesus, as He has appointed in the holy feast of bread and wine, and feeding upon Christ in our hearts by faith; we must be as punctual in those means as the thriving merchant is to be found to be at his place of business, the workman at his daily occupation, or the soldier at his parade—this is to give diligence, as the Apostle Peter expresses it, to "make your calling and election sure." "I say everywhere and to all," is the record of an eminent man of God in a former age, "I say everywhere and to all, you must hold intercourse with God, or your soul will die. You must walk with God, or Satan will walk with you. You must *grow in grace*, or you will lose it." The surest way to know that we do not fail of the grace of God is to experience it in our hearts, and to show the power of it in our daily walk. The best way to ascertain that we are under the power and blessing of grace is to live the life of faith in the Son of God, and to secure the prize, to keep the mark of our high calling ever before us, ever "looking to Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith," and "putting no confidence in the flesh."

A CROWDED and enthusiastic meeting was held in New College Hall, Oxford, on February 12th, to hear the Bishop of Bedford (since Bishop-designate of Wakefield) and the Head of the Oxford House, Mr. Henson, of All Souls, speak on work in East London. Seven heads of houses and a Syrian Bishop were present; and the hall was so full that many were unable to find seats. The interest in East London, and in all that East London represents, seems to be rising again in Oxford; and the bold and vigorous way in which the Oxford House, with only a small number of resident workers, is throwing out fresh branches, and facing some of the most difficult problems of East London life, have won for it much sympathy both among seniors and juniors.

THE *Daily News* gives a brief account of a meeting which was held at Willis's Rooms on Friday, the 17th inst., Mr. T. Hughes in the chair. It was a mixed conference of Churchmen and Dissenters "to determine, if possible, the best mode, for themselves and for the country, of adjusting the inequalities between them, and associating their religious power over the national life." Among the conveners were Dr. Martineau, Canon Bradby, the Rev. Gerald Blunt, rector of Chelsea; the Rev. A. W. Jepson, vicar of St. John's, Lambeth; the Rev. A. W. Oxford, vicar of St. Luke's, Berwick-street; and the Rev. Johnson Barker, of New College Chapel, Hampstead. They described themselves as "having organised the National Church Association," for the presentation to the country and the Legislature of a Bill which embodied the results of their own study of the Church problem. The object of the measure was to "enlarge the Church of England by confederating within it other Christian communities now subsisting by its side."

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESSE' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
 From Mr. CHARLES WHEELER, Barford, Warwick.
 "I have felt so greatly benefited by wearing your
ELECTROPATHIC BELT, that it affords me
 pleasure to be able to testify to its curative power.
 The swelling and pain in my legs have quite left me, and
 I experience a comfortable and warming sensation
 throughout my body."

GOUT & SCIATICA CURED
 Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of
 the Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,
 should at once stop physicking, and remit all, for
 HARNESSE' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain
 immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials
 POST FREE. MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
 Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1888.

DARWINISM AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.—II.

IN the second article the author approaches the question how far the "argument of design" is affected by evolution, which it is said to have destroyed. We must again bear in mind that evolution has to be distinguished from natural selection, for while the former strengthens theism, design runs the risk of being weakened by the latter; for natural selection as a cause of evolution, *i.e.*, "Darwinism" and design, as held by the older natural theologians, are mutually exclusive. According to them, the works of nature were to be compared with the works of man; that as, *e.g.*, a watch indicated design and intelligence in its maker, so do the innumerable and wonderful adaptations of means to ends in plants and animals. This view harmonised with the supposition of "special creations." It did not touch the deeper question of the origin or creation of matter, but only bore witness (as was supposed) to the existence of an all-wise and beneficent "Artificer" or "Architect."

Those adaptations exist, whatever be thought as to how they came into existence; and therefore, when evolution came to be seen to be infinitely more probable than "special creations," the question arose, If they be untenable, what is to be substituted? Now, natural selection destroys that crude idea of design even more effectually than evolution, for Mr. Darwin did not think it necessary to ask whence or how the variations arose, but simply to recognise their existence, and then to leave it to natural selection to eliminate all but the fittest to survive; so that if we detach the metaphorical idea of "selecting," we find the process

resolves itself into a "natural destruction" of the least fit to survive. Thus in an experiment of presenting to fowls a number of different kinds of caterpillars, they all refused to touch one particular kind, but ate the rest. The solitary individual species was thus the fittest to survive, but destruction goes on to an enormous extent in nature, which has nothing to do with their being the least fit to survive. Thus the eggs of the salmon are consumed by enemies which prey upon them, and those which escape destruction are not necessarily the "fittest," but simply the "luckiest." As another example, a poppy will scatter hundreds of seeds around it. The seedlings come up, but very soon a few get the mastery, and crowd out the smaller and weaker ones. Two causes account for this; first, those on the outskirts of the group have less to contend against, and are the "lucky ones"; those which survive in the midst have a stronger constitution, probably in consequence of their embryos being better provided with endosperm. They are the fittest to survive, but—be it observed—this has nothing to do with "the species," for the specific characters mainly residing in the flowers and fruits, have not appeared when the struggle takes place. Hence the expression, "Origin of species by natural selection," has little to do with this kind of struggle; so that those which live may be said to have done so by what might be well called "constitutional selection."

Let it be granted, however, that in other cases natural selection is acting upon variations in specific characters. These may occur in all parts of an organism, and because, say a lion exists, therefore it is presumed that its talons, the shape of its limbs, the colour of the hair, the form of the teeth, and every other organ, was "the fittest to survive"; but if a varying lion was selected for its talons, the difficulty which many evolutionists feel is how can natural selection guarantee that each and all the organs selected at the same time are the fittest to survive? The chances are infinity to one, for besides all the visible organs, natural selection has to act upon the microscopic tissues as well, out of which the organs are constructed, till the burden placed upon natural selection seems to be untold. Nor, if "improvements" be presumably spread over many generations, is it conceivable that any number of "accidental" variations could ever effect those wonderful adaptations which Paley thought must have been designed. Darwin himself was by no means free from this mental perplexity, for he says to Professor Asa Gray, "I am conscious that I am in an utterly hopeless muddle. I cannot think that the world, as we see it, is the result of chance, and yet I cannot look at each separate thing as the result of design." And again he says: "I am inclined to look at everything as resulting from designed laws, with the details, whether good or bad, left to the working out of what we may call chance."

But the moment he admits "designed laws," natural selection, as he understood it, is put out of court in its turn, and a teleology reintroduced. For Mr. Darwin compared an organism to a "noble and commodious building" erected by an architect who used nothing but fragments of rock picked up at the foot of a precipice, which have *not* been shaped or dressed artificially in any way by the architect, who simply made use of flat ones for the roof, curved ones for tops of arches, etc., and so on. Now the flaw in this argument, as it seems to us, is that no architect could build a "noble" edifice at all comparable to an animal out of such materials, but must, and *would dress the stones for the purpose*. And this "dressing" corresponds with his "designed laws," by which the means to ends in organised structures are obtained.

This introduction of the "new teleology" was admitted by Mr. Darwin. Professor A. Gray remarks: "Let us recognise Darwin's great service to natural science in bringing back to it teleology, so that instead of morphology *versus* teleology, we shall have morphology wedded to teleology." To this Darwin replied: "What you say about teleology pleases me especially, and I do not think any one else had ever noticed the point. I have always said you were the man to hit the nail on the head." This being the case, it is clear that natural selection cannot be credited with "purpose," *i.e.*, teleology, which Mr. Darwin continually asserts is present in organic structures, and it must be relegated to such inferior positions as I have alluded to above. This seems to be the view which practically scientists are rapidly coming to hold, while the origin of all means to ends is regarded as the joint product of the action of the environment upon the responsive power of protoplasm. By this joint action the offspring appear already prepared to some extent to meet the requirements of their social conditions; these incipient preparations become intensified in their offspring in turn, and thus many (not one or two, as *all* the offspring will vary simultaneously in the same direction), will survive to establish the new variety. Where natural selection acts, appears to me to be mainly during the earliest periods of growth, in the elimination of the weaklings. It is therefore much the same as infant mortality; while those that survive do so by constitutional selection or simply through good fortune.

If this view of evolutionary teleology be accepted, then the Christian apologist has nothing to fear; for if it was thought to be a worthy view of the Creator to consider an organ and *a fortiori* an organism as designed, then to conceive that He had evolved all the species that ever existed and do exist, through natural laws implanted in Being itself, must involve a far greater power than that which merely imitates a man. It is as if the first watchmaker had endowed a watch, not only with

the power to reproduce itself, but, by self-adaptation to circumstances, developed not only all the varieties of watches, but also all the species and genera of clocks and chronometers that exist in the world. And, what is more, implanted in all alike recuperative powers, so that they should be self-mending when out of order.

In the preceding remarks I have travelled somewhat beyond the article in the *Guardian*, the author of which goes on to observe that looking at destruction as the rule, and survival as the exception, as the actual case in nature, "all down the scale of sentient being, 'perfection by suffering,' seems written in unmistakable characters. The waste is enormous and the suffering terrible. It is not enough to say reverently 'it is God's will,' a statement paralleled by 'God created them,' and only an admission that we cannot explain the facts and justify them to the reason and conscience. It may be necessary, as it certainly is a devout attitude of mind, but there is in it an undertone of despair."

The present writer is inclined to think that this is far too strong language; and that sentiment is sometimes apt to colour one's reason too much. Apart from man, who is exceptional in that he can anticipate troubles, and can work incalculable harm upon other beings; I think the "evils" in nature have been vastly overrated. The two which we attribute to animals, and of these only the higher series, are fear and bodily pain. Observations, however, tend to show that the latter is very far short of being what it is in man, and the former is reduced to a minimum by the want of anticipation and the power of entertaining any abstraction as an object of thought. The duration of either one or the other is extremely limited. All observations, as it seems to me, go to prove, that by far the greater portion of any animal's life is simply placid enjoyment, and that Paley was not far wrong when he said, "The air, the earth, and the water teem with delighted existence." We must be cautious against reading into nature our own human sentiments, and exaggerating the feelings of animals when there may be but little or no grounds for the supposition that their life is either miserable or painful.

GEORGE HENSLOW.

THE *Durham Advertiser* announces with deep regret the death of the Rev. John Low Low, vicar of Wittonstall. The rev. gentleman, who was Hebrew and Divinity Prizeman of University College, Durham, was ordained in 1844. After serving three years as assistant-curate at St. Margaret's, Durham, he ministered for twenty-six years in the parish of Forest-with-Harwood, Upper Teesdale; but in 1872 was presented to the benefice which he held at the time of his death. He was an accomplished scholar, and an antiquary of no small attainments.

THE GERALDINES.

"SHANID-ABO."

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.

(Continued from page 82.)

CHAPTER II.

REBELLION OF SILKEN THOMAS.

WHEN the lordship of Ireland was conferred upon Henry II., the reasons assigned were that the borders of the Church might be enlarged, vice restrained and manners corrected, but when we turn to the state of the country at the accession of Henry VIII., so far from its condition being improved, we find matters in a worse state than at the date of the Norman invasion. English rule extended in 1515 over about one-half of Louth, Dublin, Meath, Kildare, and Wexford. The rest of the country was subject to some sixty petty chiefs, living by the sword, and acknowledging no authority except the law of might. O'Neill of Tyrone, O'Donnell of Tyrconnell, MacMahon of Uriel, O'Reilly of Cavan, Maguire of Fermanagh, and many more held the north; MacCarthy More ruled in Kerry, the O'Connor Roe and the MacDermott in Connaught, the O'Brien in Thomond, the O'Moore in Leix, the MacGilla Patrick in Ossory, while some thirty lords of English descent, but living after the Irish custom, held feudal state in their strong castles throughout the country, and rivalled the Milesian chieftains in pride and turbulence. The whole island was convulsed by the broils between the Butlers and Geraldines. England had settled Ireland with a feudal aristocracy to hold the land in her interest, but the settlers had gradually assimilated themselves to the old inhabitants until, in course of time, they had grown "more Irish than the Irish themselves." It was not, however, the Tudor policy to advance the power and privileges of the nobles. The old plan of governing Ireland by means of a feudal aristocracy failed because England had not kept up a proper control over her colonists. Henry VIII. instituted a new departure, and tried to govern the Irish by means of officials, English by birth, training and sentiment. These men could hold the balance evenly between a Butler and a Geraldine, but they were rapacious, greedy, cruel, and intolerant in their dealings with the native Irish.*

On the accession of Henry VIII. the Earl of Kildare was continued as lord deputy, and when the brave old baron died in 1513, the office was conferred on his son Gerald. Kildare, proud of his race and lofty station, cared little to conciliate the hereditary enemies of his house, of whom the Earl of Ormond was the most dangerous. Ormond secured the favour of the all-powerful Wolsey, and by underhand representations so worked upon the king, that Kildare was summoned to England to explain his conduct; but

his marriage with Elizabeth Grey, daughter of the Marquis of Dorset, and the favour he won by attending Henry to Calais and contributing to the splendour of the monarch's interview with the king of France baffled the designs of his enemies. Meantime, the Earl of Surrey, the lord lieutenant, acted with great vigour against the Irish septs. He seems to have held the opinion that the only remedy for the troubles of the island was a new conquest to be followed up by a new scheme of colonisation from England, "for do what we can, the Irish will relapse." It does not seem to have occurred to Surrey, or any English statesman of those days, that the Irish got no chance of improvement under a government that neither protected their property from spoliation nor their persons from violence. On the recall of Surrey the reins of office were handed over to Ormond, but his tenure of office was short, and Kildare succeeded him as lord deputy in 1524. When the new viceroy, after having taken the usual oath, went in procession to the abbey of St. Thomas, in Dublin, the sword of state was borne before him by Con O'Neill, head of the northern Hy-Neill, with whom he was closely connected by marriage. The pretensions of the Geraldine became every day more arrogant. He renounced English customs and assumed the state of an Irish chief. His kinsman Desmond was convicted of holding treasonable intercourse with the king of France, but Kildare would not proceed to extremities against him. The lord deputy was summoned to England in 1526 to explain his conduct, and he was there arrested and flung into the Tower. We may derive some idea of the state of Ireland during this reign from the following incident. Maurice Doran, Bishop of Leighlin, offended some of his clergy, and among others Maurice Cavanagh, his archdeacon, son of the Abbot of Duske. The bishop, anxious to have the dispute amicably settled, attended a meeting of the clergy in 1524, when the adherents of the archdeacon fell upon him and murdered him. So powerful was the influence of the Geraldines, that it was impossible to govern the country without the co-operation of the Earl of Kildare, and when Sir William Skeffington came over to succeed Lord Delvin as vice-deputy, Kildare was released, and sent over to aid the government in keeping order. He soon succeeded in procuring the recall of Skeffington and his own appointment to the office of vice-deputy. His pride and turbulence now became insupportable, and when Wolsey, his implacable enemy, was disgraced, his insolence grew to such a height, that his friends accounted for his violence by the charitable supposition that a wound in the head had deranged his intellect. How little the Irish respected the government at this time was proved by the raid of the O'Briens upon Dublin Castle. Having plundered the country far and wide with impunity for more than a year, O'Brien became bolder, and advanced upon Dublin. He surprised the castle by a night attack, plundered it and carried away many prisoners and much booty. Such a state of affairs could not last always, and in 1533 the Council sent Sir John Allen, the Master of the Rolls, to lay before the king a true statement of the condition of Ireland. The sum of the complaints forwarded to England was that by the tyranny and exactions of the nobles English freeholders had been rooted out of the whole country, and their places supplied, even in the Pale, by Irish tenants, accustomed to this unsettled condition of society. Allen was further instructed to inform Henry, "that his

* A curious account of Ireland at this period has been preserved in the English State Paper Office. It is embodied in "A Report on the State of Ireland in 1535." State Papers, Henry VIII. This report seems to have been an abridgment of a book, published by a writer called Pandarus, who wrote a work, "Salus Populi," setting forth the cause of the Miseries of Ireland, and how they may be remedied.—Ware's "Irish Writers," p. 23.

land of Ireland was so much decayed as that the king's lawes were not obeyed twenty miles in compas." The Council declared their belief that English deputies should be sent over and that the government should not be intrusted to native lords, and Allen carried private instructions to lay the blame of the ruin of the island on the Earl of Kildare. The broils between the Butlers and Geraldines were in truth the source of great part of the troubles of government, and of the miseries of the peasantry under the administration of the Earl of Kildare, but Henry VIII. knew how to crush the pretensions of a troublesome subject, and he determined to break once and for ever the Geraldine influence. Kildare was summoned once more to England, whither he repaired with great reluctance, February, 1534. Before his departure he appointed his son, Lord Thomas FitzGerald, better known in history as "Silken Thomas," from the splendour of his retinue, vice-deputy of Ireland. A fiery youth of twenty-one, headstrong, violent, and with unbounded confidence in the power of the Geraldine interest, was likely before long to afford his enemies occasion of complaint. The two Allens, the Archbishop of Dublin and Sir John Allen, Master of the Rolls, were particularly odious to the Geraldine faction, while they on their part lost no opportunity of weakening the power and hastening the destruction of the house of Kildare. They spread a report that Kildare had been put to death privately in the Tower. The young Geraldine fell into the trap and rushed to arms. Collecting his followers he rode into Dublin, and proceeded to St. Mary's abbey, where the Council was being held. He inveighed bitterly against the government, flung down the sword of state, and declared he would rather meet the English power in the field, than support it in office.

At the head of his wild riders he passed through the city, the townsmen being either too weak to check his progress or perhaps, as is more probable, too much in sympathy with his disaffection. Archbishop Allen and Lord Finglass took refuge in the Castle, where they were besieged by the Geraldines. Allen, afraid of falling into the hands of his enemy, escaped from the fortress and got on board a small vessel at Dames' Gate, hoping to make his way to England, but the boat went ashore at Clontarf and Allen was obliged to seek shelter at Artane. The house was surrounded during the night by the followers of Silken Thomas, who dragged the prelate out of bed, and brought him almost naked into the presence of their chief. The Archbishop fell upon his knees and besought him to spare the life of an old man, but the Geraldine turned contemptuously away, exclaiming: "Away with the churl"; and his retainers, interpreting the words literally as an order to slay the enemy of their lord, stabbed him to death. This crime alienated from Silken Thomas much of the support he would otherwise have received. Rome hurled her curse at the head of the impious Catholic who had dared to shed the blood of a prelate of the Church. Kildare died in the Tower of a broken heart when the news of the murder reached him. Dublin City declared against the Geraldine cause, and after a sharp contest he was compelled to raise the siege of the Castle. He fortified the strongholds of the FitzGerald at Maynooth, Rathangan, Athy, and Carlow, urged O'Neill and O'Donnell to espouse his quarrel, and encouraged by the apathy of Sir William Skeffington, the deputy, now an old man and in delicate health, he seemed likely to prove a formidable

enemy to the English interest. The struggle was not brought to a close until 1535, when the capture of Maynooth gave a heavy blow to the cause of the insurgents. This fortress was invested by the lord deputy, to whom it was surrendered by the governor, Christopher Parese, a foster brother of Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, who resolved when he saw the cause of his chief declining to purchase his own safety by the betrayal of his trust. Skeffington gladly availed himself of his perfidy, and promised him a reward, but when the castle was surrendered, he first paid the traitor the stipulated bribe, then ordered him to be hanged as "a false knave."

In 1535 Silken Thomas surrendered under an assurance that his life would be spared, but this promise, too, was violated, and he was sent prisoner to London. Skeffington dying in 1535, Lord Leonard Gray succeeded him as lord-deputy in 1536. He seized the five uncles of the Geraldine, and sent them with Silken Thomas to England, where they were thrown into the Tower. There they lay in extreme misery for nearly a year, when they were hanged at Tyburn, February 3, 1536. Thus for a time was the power of the Geraldine faction broken.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE BREAD WHICH CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN.

SIR,—If your correspondent "Inquirens" has misunderstood me, it is probably my own fault in not expressing myself plainly. The nature of the influence of the Holy Ghost towards our Lord's Mother, is set forth in Luke i. ver. 35. I am not, however, guilty of heresy, as he supposes; it is not heresy to differ from Bishop Pearson, and I do not admit that I do differ from him. I have not made any off-hand statement, I think; I asked a question, which is different from making a statement. I must now ask another. If the view that is suggested in the question in my letter dated 5th, is not one of the theories which Pearson exposes, how is it one of those matters which the same great theologian shows were decided in the earliest ages?

I have been led in some measure to incline towards the view; viz., that to say our Lord's Body came down from heaven is no perversion of our Saviour's words, no misinterpreting of the Incarnation, and no mere figurative language; I have been led towards this by observing the marginal note in the new New Testament, John iii. ver. 13; and by considering, that in the discourse in chap. vi., our Lord speaks of Himself and His flesh as being the same. The Son of Man was not in Heaven, from whence He had descended, when He was talking to Nicodemus. But He speaks of having descended from Heaven; and in the public discourse He speaks of Himself and of His flesh and blood indifferently, and of their being the source of spiritual or eternal life to the world and to believers.

I can explain no further, because these mysteries do not admit of explanation, but of declarations only. When our Lord was asked, how could He give His

flesh to be eaten, He did not explain ; but referred to His coming Ascension as proving what he said to be true. The mystery of our Lord's presence in the Holy Eucharist, is likewise not to be explained ; and this very fact that it is supra-natural is the completest denial of the carnal explanation, founded on false metaphysics, given in the modern doctrine of transubstantiation.

I repeat again, that I do not desire to dogmatise. I believe, however, that there is nothing new in the above. In the last published book of Charles George Gordon, "Reflections in Palestine," there are some very valuable observations on what he boldly terms the incarnation of the Holy Spirit in believers, which is really the same subject as that treated of by your correspondent. I am indebted to him both on account of his scrupulous desire, not to misunderstand me ; and also because his remarks have led me to examine this subject, both in the Greek Testament and in some old books of mine with a good deal of closeness.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

February 20th, 1888.

SIR,—In order to be brief in my exposition I must apologise for having been obscure. Because the elementary particles in the thing nourished and in that which nourishes it are identical, bread as the staff of life becomes the flesh and blood of man. We are not far from speaking literal truth when we say, "Bread is body," "Bread is flesh and blood," and our Lord pronounced a real physical fact when he said, "This Bread is My Body." The interpretation of these words I take to be that as bread in the body becomes flesh in the members, so, still speaking figuratively, the bread of heaven in Christ becomes the flesh of Christ in us ; or, speaking literally, the nature of God in Christ becomes the nature of Christ in our spirits. And so we, partaking of Christ's nature, are partakers of the Divine nature.

This allegory of our Lord's flesh and blood was very ably explained in a sermon by Canon Rawstorne, that appeared in the PULPIT a few years since, viz., in Vol. xv.

MEDICUS.

DARWINISM.

SIR,—I cannot approve of the articles in the *Guardian* on Darwinism. I have been a devoted naturalist from my childhood in my way, and the difficulties, quite setting aside the theological side of the question, are great : (1.) Geological testimony shows that in transitions advance is not the rule but often the retrograde ; the animal world is inferior now to what it was even in our own historical days. (2.) No mixture of different creatures is proved in a state of nature ; the passage in Gen. xxxvi. 24 is known to be a false translation ; there are no naturally bred mules, all hybrids come from domesticity, which is an opposition to the laws of nature. I remember Yarrell in his "British Birds" mentions the mating together of a carrion crow and a hooded crow (*C. corone* with *C. cornix*), but unless the birds were seen feeding young and were shot and examined, I should doubt even that such allied species would ever mate. It is not an unknown thing for birds that are very black to be subject to partial or total albinism,

and most likely this was a case of the partial kind ; then the parti-coloured bird could easily be mistaken for *C. cornix*. All history forbids the theory, and surely if it were true we should see it in progress, even though slow.

F. T. B.

"ATTACK THE TOWN FROM THE OTHER SIDE."—LORD WELLINGTON AT BADAJOS.

SIR,—It is well to try one side when the other is too strong. The *Church Times* used to assail the 28th Article. Though that article condemns transubstantiation by name, yet forsooth it meant something else, as if our reformers, who spent their lives over transubstantiation, could not call it by its right name. To this the *Church Times* replied, in 1881, that when the articles were drawn up, the Romish party had to be pleased as well as the Protestant. Well, what followed, by way of compromise on this *via media* plan? Why, that our article, instead of condemning transaccidantation merely, which is denounced by Rome as well as by us, anathematised transubstantiation, which Trent makes an article of Faith ! This is strange logic indeed, or rather transparent nonsense.

2. But now the 28th Article is left, and the Black Rubric is attacked. "Try the other side," as the Duke said. Well, let us see what is done in this quarter. Whoever wants to know what Ritualists say, must learn it from their advice to their penitents, more than from their sermons to all. So, in the *Church Times* you are to mind, not so much its leaders and large print, as what it says in small print, to those who consult it on cases of conscience. We have three of these hints in the number for the 17th inst. 1st, to W. S. it replies, "If you believe the Real Presence, you will naturally accord the accustomed tokens of respect." Here Real Presence means Bodily Presence ; and, of course, whoever believes that God is present there bodily, will adore Him by all reverential acts. But Real Presence need mean no such thing. Virtue went really out of our Lord, but this virtue was not adored as if it was part of His Body. Next, it sends A. C. to "the Christian Passover," a regular Popish feast, which says falsely that our Lord's Body passed through the rock (p. 16), though the Gospel says the angel rolled away the stone. It also founds on "This is my Body," the monstrous addition, "Body, blood, soul, and divinity" (p. 21). Then the *Church Times* goes on to say, "The Black Rubric is not directed against transubstantiation, but against a localised and carnal or physical Presence." This is unmitigated nonsense. If the Black Rubric was not plain against Romish doctrine, would not our Irish revisionists—root and branch men—have made it more effectual when they tried their hand on it? They handled, and let it alone. They could not pretend to "paint the lily or refine the gold." Yet, after these ultra-revisionists, like Lord Ebury, took off their hands, as though a touch would spoil it, the *Church Times* tells us that it does not hit Roman doctrine at all ! Can any audacity surpass this? What does the Black Rubric say? That our Lord's Body is now a natural Body, that is, subject to the laws appertaining to natural bodies, that it is in heaven alone, and cannot be here locally. And yet we are gravely told that all that this

means is, that, it being no natural body, nor subject to such laws, is really present, only without the accidents of look, taste, etc. Was there ever such barefaced nonsense? Were our Reformers such idiots that they could not say what they meant? Were our violent revisionists here such idiots as not to spy out the blot, if one there was, and correct it, when they had it on the dissecting table before them?

3. It is very amusing to see how the Black Rubric is treated at both sides of the water. Here one of our wiseacres stated in our *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, without rebuke from editor, that it was smuggled in in 1662 by some anonymous hand, and has no legal authority whatsoever. Then, again, we are told because the wording is "corporal" instead of "real and essential" of Edward's Rubric, the Edward's article has "real and bodily" showing that all the three terms are the same; yet we are told that it now "virtually enjoins" adoration. Truth is one, heresy varies its forms. But I must stop for the present; I have given an illustration of the duke's words "attack on the other side." When we were children we had a game—"Turn about three times and catch whom you can." Here it is played to perfection. 1st the Black Rubric is kicked out of the Prayer Book, though signed all the same; 2nd, It is hugged and kissed as enjoining adoration; 3rd, It is made a nose of wax, meaning anything or nothing—so we have returned to children's games in our old ages!

A CATHOLIC, BUT A TRUE PROTESTANT.

P.S.—Since writing the above, I have looked at the 28th Article again. We are told by Ritualists that our Reformers, when they condemned transubstantiation by name, meant to condemn something else, even the heresy that the outward appearances are changed, as well as the substance. Such a mistake, by men who lived and died for that very article is too hard to be believed. Again we are asked to believe that, in order to please Romanisers, they condemned not a theory, denounced by Rome, as Transaccidentation was, but one held by Trent an article of faith. This is preposterous. But the article actually explains what it means: it says "The change of the substance," whereas if it meant to condemn transaccidentation alone, it would have said "Of substance and accidents both." But with the lawyer, I may add, "He that will say this will say anything."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Armstrong, Rev. B. J., Jun., M.A., Senior Curate of East Dereham; Rector of Heydon, Norfolk.
 Atlay, Rev. Dr., Archdeacon of Calcutta; Vicar of Willesden.
 Barry, Rev. Walter George, Chaplain at Madras.
 Blake, Rev. W. Aston, M.A., Chaplain of the Suffolk Lunatic Asylum.
 Bowly, Rev. C. H., Vicar of Messing, Essex; Vicar of St. Michael's, Sydenham.
 Brooke, Rev. C. W. A., M.A., Mission Chaplain to the Bishop of Bedford at the London Hospital.
 Brown, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Cretingham, Suffolk.
 Cronshaw, Rev. H. P., Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools for Liverpool.
 Curtis, Rev. Edward, Vicar of Newton-on-Trent; Rector of Little Bytham, Lincolnshire.
 Deck, Rev. Francis Edmund, Vicar of Cransford, Suffolk.
 Downton, Rev. Cecil, B.A., Vicar of Hoxne, Suffolk.

Gardiner, Rev. Edward R., Rector of Radwell, Herts; Vicar of Fawley, Wantage, Berks.
 Hall, Rev. H. Armstrong, Incumbent of Brunswick Chapel; Secretary of the Church Parochial Mission Society.
 Hands, Rev. Alfred Watson, A.K.C., Vicar of St. Mary's, Southtown, Suffolk.
 Howes, Rev. G. P., Vicar of Halling, Rochester.
 James, Rev. Charles W., M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Cuthbert's, Blyth, Northumberland.
 Jones, Rev. D. P., Vicar of Colwyn, Denbighshire.
 Jones, Rev. John Sheldon, to the Consolidated Chapelry of All Saints, Ipswich.
 Lacey, Rev. T. A., Assistant-Master of Denstone College; Second Master of the King's College, Taunton.
 Lee, Rev. Robert M'C. L., Vicar of Great Toller, Dorset.
 Lloyd, Rev. C. A., Rural Dean of Wraggöe.
 Penwarne-Wellings, Rev. E., Licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Exeter.
 Phillips, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. John-the-Baptist's, Pilling, Fleetwood; Vicar of Roeburn, West Australia.
 Powley, Rev. Robert, Chaplain of Queen's College, Oxford, and Assistant-Master at Cowley College; Rector of Upton Scudamore, Wilts.
 Pryce-Jones, Rev. H. C., M.A., Vicar of Diseworth, Leicestershire; Rector of Wormshill, Kent.
 Roberts, Rev. John A. J., M.A., Curate of Chillingham; Perpetual Curate of Byrness, Northumberland.
 Sellon, Rev. William Storer, Perpetual Curate of Llanveyno, Hereford.
 Simpson, Rev. Joseph, Rector of Castleford, Yorkshire.
 Slacke, Rev. Richard Henry Ernest, Chaplain at Bombay.
 Snape, Rev. R. H., Vicar of Eskdale, Cumberland.
 Sneyd, Rev. Clement Broughton, Perpetual Curate of Shocklach, Cheshire.
 Square, Rev. Ernest, M.A., Rector of St. Mary Steps, Exeter.
 Stone, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Rector of Charleton, Kingsbridge.
 Strong, Rev. Lorimer Wilson, M.A., Minister of St. Matthew's, Jersey.
 Surman, Rev. John Gilbert, B.A., Rector of Healing, Lincolnshire.
 Thomas, Rev. Richard E., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Jude's, Newcastle; Vicar of Bolam, Northumberland.
 Thomas, Rev. T. W. Embleton, Curate of New Eltham; Curate-in-Charge of St. Nicholas's, Deptford.
 Trousdale, Rev. William George, B.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Stephen's, Upton Park, Plaistow.
 Webb, Rev. William Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Ashby-de-la-Launde, Sleaford.
 Webster, Rev. F. S., Principal of the Church Army Training Home; Missioner of the Church Parochial Mission Society.
 Wrenford, Rev. Joshua Booth, Rector of Knoddishall-with-Buxlow, Suffolk.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brown, Rev. Thomas Cooper, at 42, St. Giles', Oxford, on the 14th inst., aged 74.
 Hammick, Rev. Sir St. Vincent Love, Bart., for fifty-two years Vicar of the parish, at the Vicarage, Milton Abbott, Devon, on the 19th inst., in his 82nd year.
 May, Rev. Thomas, for forty-six years Vicar of Leigh, near Tunbridge, Kent, at Leigh, on the 19th inst., aged 89 years and 11 months.
 Phillips, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, for nearly forty years, at St. Matthew's, Oakley Square, on the 14th inst., in his 77th year.
 Powell, Rev. George Francis Sydenham, at Sutton Veny, near Warminster, on the 16th inst.
 Walsh, Rev. Henry George, for nearly forty-seven years Vicar of St. John's, at St. John's Vicarage, Apsley Road, Clifton, on the 17th inst., aged 80.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CONFESSIONS OF SOLOMON.

BY THE VERY REV. J. J. STEWART PEROWNE,
D.D., DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 15TH, 1888.

“Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou for all these things God will bring thee into judgment. Therefore remove sorrow from thy heart, and put away evil from thy flesh; for youth and the prime of life are vanity. Remember also thy Creator in the days of thy youth, or ever the evil days come, and the years draw nigh, when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them.”—ECCLES. xi. 9—xii. 1.

IT is in this healthy, bracing tone, it is in these words of manly wisdom, that the Preacher brings to a close the volume of his Confessions. His tone has not always been thus bright and hopeful. It has sometimes been melancholy, cynical, sceptical, all but despairing. Bitterness, disappointment, vanity—these had been the burden of his book. But he has learnt by God’s discipline the true wisdom, the old faith of his childhood has never been wholly discarded, and he gives you the benefit of his experience. The book is that most touching of all autobiographies, the autobiography of a human heart, the true and faithful record of its struggles, its fears, its hopes, its perplexities, its anguish. The Preacher hides nothing. He unclaps the secret journal of his inner life, and he invites you to read it with him. He lays bare before you what he had been, what he had thought and done, what he had seen, and felt, and suffered, and then he asks you to listen to the judgment which he has formed on this tangled maze of human life.

I do not stop to inquire at any length to-day who was the author and what was the date of this singular book, unique in Jewish literature. The answer to these questions turns upon critical disquisitions which are hardly fitted even for an academic pulpit. Suffice it to remark that if we are to judge of it by its linguistic peculiarities and by its general tone, as well as by the fact that so late as the first century of our era it was still a moot point in the Jewish schools whether, in rabbinical phrase, it “defiled the hands”—*i.e.*, whether it had been rightly deemed canonical—the conclusion seems all but certain that it must be placed among the latest books of the Old

Testament canon. Besides, the writer appears almost certainly to have come under the influence of Greek philosophy. An accomplished scholar, Professor Mahaffy, has very recently pointed out some remarkable coincidences between the sayings of Heraclitus and the sayings of Ecclesiastes. There are, moreover, passages in the book which furnish striking parallels to the Epicurean philosophy as it is interpreted by Lucretius. I would not, indeed, attach too much importance to similarities of this kind. It is not surprising that thinkers pondering the mysteries of the universe and the strangely complicated drama of human life should have fallen into the same vein, should have been struck by the same problems, and have given utterance to similar thoughts respecting them. The melancholy, the questioning, the scepticism, which are found in Ecclesiastes, have been found in the Eastern mystics, and in poets so far removed from Ecclesiastes and from one another as Shakespeare and Tennyson. Thoughts like these are not the product of one age, or one country, or one philosophical school. They are the common heritage of all deeply moved hearts and minds. Still it must be admitted that the Jewish mind was not naturally reflective, it was averse from speculation, and it is at least not improbable that the thought of this Jewish preacher may have been coloured by Greek philosophy.

The story is the story of a singularly rich and varied experience, of great power, and vast wealth, and the magnificence and luxury of an Eastern despot. But you have also what is of far more worth—the true tale of one of the largest hearts that God ever gave to man. The Preacher is not only one who had had splendid opportunities, but one who set himself deliberately to turn those opportunities to the best account. He would live, and he would reflect upon life; he would solve the problem, Is life worth living? “I gave myself,” he says, “to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things that are done under heaven.” He had made up his mind to enjoy all the pleasures which lay within his reach; he would enter into every pursuit which seemed likely to gratify the ambition of his intellect or the demands of his taste; he would explore the mysteries of nature; he would solace himself with poetry and song; he would build for himself stately palaces and lay out fair parks and gardens, and plant them with all manner of trees. He would surround himself, in a word, with all that could please the eye, and minister to comfort, and gratify taste. And he did all this. In the vivid autobiographical fragment which you find in the second chapter of the book, he tells us that he tried all and each in turn. He threw himself with ardour into each fresh pursuit. And through all, he tells us, *his wisdom remained with him*. His was no vulgar pursuit of riches or of pleasure; he never forgot himself;

pleasure never dulled or brutalised him. There was the regal intellect, as well as the regal will and the regal power. He sat like a mighty magician among all the splendour he had conjured, its master, not its slave. Never man tried the experiment on a larger scale nor with fairer chance of success than the King of Israel when he sought to find satisfaction for an immortal spirit in all the manifold avenues of satisfaction which were at his command. And what is the result? What is the burden of his Confessions? Is it success? Is it happiness? Is it contentment? No. The one mournful, monotonous undertone runs through all, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity."

At times, as I have said, a darker shadow rests upon his soul. It is not weariness only; it is not disappointment; it is blank, shivering scepticism. What is the world, with its ever-shifting show, its intolerable repetitions, its monotony and its misery, its mockery of hope, its loud, blatant defiance of all truth and justice? (iii. 16; iv. 1). Can any traces be discerned therein of law and order, of supreme wisdom and moral government? "All things come alike to all. There is one event to the righteous and to the wicked, to the good and to the clean and the unclean. . . . As is the good, so is the sinner, and he that sweareth as he that feareth an oath. This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun: that there is one event unto all." What is man, with his vast aspirations, and his poor, miserable, petty, scheming life? Is he any better than a beast? "As the one dieth, so dieth the other. Who knoweth whether the spirit of a man goeth upward, and whether the spirit of a beast goeth downward to the earth?"

So speaks the Preacher in his bitterness. Yes, "The Confessions of Solomon"* is the saddest book in the Bible. It chills you to the heart to read it; you seem to yourself to be walking in the Valley of the Shadow of Death, where frowning precipices shut you in on either hand; you are wandering in a dark and tangled forest, torn by its prickly undergrowth, and choked by its miasma, and bitten by its deadly snakes, and yet ever and anon a ray of light breaks upon you, and at the end you emerge from the dreary swamp and the thick overhanging boughs into the sunshine of God. A fresh air blows upon your cheek, warmth and light are upon your path, and the broad ocean of God's love lies before you, gilded by the rays of the everlasting morning. The man who has given you such a sad picture of human life, of its deep unrest, of its unsatisfied cravings, of the vanity of all pursuits apart from God, does not leave you there. He has learnt wisdom by his experience. He has something to teach you. If he has known what an unhappy life is, he will give you the secret of a happy one. If he has been restless, feverish,

disappointed, he would save you from the like restlessness and disappointment.

This it is which makes the book so precious. It is so obviously written by a man of the world; it is so obviously the fruit of his knowledge and observation; and his conviction after all is that to fear God and keep His commandments is man's highest life. This it is which makes his advice to the young so full of point and earnestness. Young men are apt to say, Oh, it is all very well for parsons to preach who are ignorant of the world, who know very little of what passion and temptation are, who have never felt the attraction and the fascination of the world, and whose profession makes it their business to insist upon the excellence of religion. Or it is all very well for those who are calmly entrenched in their own dogmatic system, and who know nothing of the doubts and difficulties which spring thick in our path, whether we listen to the teachings of science or whether we look at the stern facts of the universe, to ask us to accept a Gospel encumbered with miracles and a hard, unyielding creed. It is too late in the day to bid us bow down our necks under the yoke of dogmatic assertion, or to require us to accept on your authority what is repugnant to our reason and to the cultivated intellect of this enlightened age. Yes, but you cannot pretend on such grounds to disregard the Preacher who speaks to you in this book. This is no strait-laced minister of religion, whose peculiarities you might be disposed to mimic, or whose solemnity of tone you might think an excellent subject for ridicule. He does not ask you to accept miracles or dogmas. The Preacher is a layman, not a priest. He is a man of the world, not a recluse. He is no sour moralist of the schools, who condemns the vices to which he has felt no temptation, or who looks askance with an eye of something like half regret at the pleasures on which he frowns, or the follies at which he sneers. Nor is he the stern ascetic, who can make no allowance for human frailty, and bids you crush with hand of iron the uprisings of human passion. No, nor is he merely the sated voluptuary, who has drained the cup of pleasure to the dregs, and who, tired and disgusted with his own excesses, now, with enfeebled frame and jaded appetite, pronounces the mournful condemnation of his former self. He is the calm, prudent, philosophical, accomplished man of the world. He is a man of culture and refinement, he is a man who, while he denied himself no gratification which a position of singular wealth and enormous power could command, and while he was furnished with all the appliances of luxury, and while he mixed in all those pursuits to which an honourable ambition invited him, knew how to use these things with wisdom and moderation. Few men could possess such opportunities; few could know so well how to make use of them: few could have understood so thoroughly all forms and phases of life; few

* The writer seems to assume the *role* of Solomon.

could pronounce so fair a verdict: "For I was great," he says, "and increased more than all that were in Jerusalem before me; *also my wisdom remained with me.*" The authority, therefore, with which he speaks cannot be questioned. If ever there was a man whom we might be disposed to take as our guide through life, it is one who shows us that he has felt all its fascinations, sounded all its depths, penetrated all its disguises, one, moreover, who has faced bravely the moral problems of the universe, who has been perplexed by the mysteries of Providence, who at one time had trembled on the verge of scepticism, or even toppled over into the gulf, who had been tempted to find refuge in a blank materialism, and who therefore addresses you with a knowledge, and a wisdom, and a power of sympathy, which in their combination are as rare as they are precious.

Such is the man. What is his teaching? What is the advice he gives you? What does this wise man, this man of knowledge and experience, say, as looking back at the end of the years, he sees others setting out on the voyage of life? How does this wise pilot bid them shun the rocks, and shoals, and quicksands on which the gallant vessel of youth, leaving the harbour with sails all set and breezes all fair, so often makes shipwreck? How does he address the young? "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart and in the sight of thine eyes." Do such words astonish us? Does the Preacher contradict the law which says, "Ye shall not walk after your own heart and your own eyes?" (Num. xv. 39). Is he in direct conflict with the Psalmist, who writes, "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? Even by ruling himself after Thy word"? Is the strain after all no better than that of Epicurus or Anacreon? Does he say, Young men will be young men; they must sow their wild oats; religion will do very well by-and-by. That cannot be, for the Preacher bids you fear God and remember your Creator. Or is it, as some would persuade us, the language of a cynical scorn? Is it that the Preacher holds up to you the empty, shrivelled mask of the world, that he may mock your joy, and taking off the kingly crown and the robe of pride, does he show you the grinning death's-head beneath, and then bid you rejoice if you can? No; he means what he says. There is the full sympathy with youth, even if there is seriousness and almost sadness in his tone. He would not attract you else. You must make men feel that you understand them if you would win them; and above all this is true as regards the young. How often the austere voice of age chills and repels the youthful heart. The youthful heart has bright visions, golden dreams, a future which seems boundless. It has no patience with your stern maxims and your cold preaching about duty; it hates the hoary wisdom which has

lost the life, and the glow, and the eager freshness which makes earth a paradise with its rich promise of perpetual enjoyment. But go to it as the Preacher goes in this book; go to it with the frank sympathy and the affectionate voice which says, "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth. Be happy in youth, for not to be happy now would be to despise one of God's best gifts of love; the bright smile, and the cheerful, unclouded brow, and the merry, ringing laugh, these are the heritage of youth; the cares of life and the sorrows of life will come soon enough; do not anticipate them; keep that happy, elastic temper as long as you can; let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth."

Yes, you young men can listen to the Preacher who counsels you thus. You like his heartiness and his practical good sense; you are not afraid of his grey hairs; you feel he understands you; even if the snows of life's winter are creeping upon him, they have not chilled his heart. But will you go with him a step further? How would he ensure you this blessed gift of gladness and innocent mirth? How would he keep your heart fresh through all the coming years? By casting over it the shadow of judgment and the fear of God. "Walk in the ways of thine heart and in the sight of thine eyes, but know that for all these things"—for all this life of careless joy—"God will bring thee into judgment." Let the thought sober thee. "Remove sorrow from thy heart, and put away evil from thy flesh; for childhood and youth" (without God) "are vanity." He wishes you to be happy; he wishes you to put away sorrow from your heart, and evil from your flesh. He wishes you to spare yourself the misery of a wasted life, of an accusing conscience, of a bitter, abiding remorse. In all that strangely chequered life, through all those temptations and difficulties, he had never quite drifted from the old faith of his childhood, he had clung to it, he recurs to it ever and anon, and he knew what a stay it had been. "I said in mine heart, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked" (iii. 17). "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be not ready to offer the sacrifice of fools" (v. 1). "Fear thou God" (v. 7). "I find more bitter than death the woman whose heart is as nets and snares, and her hands as bands; whoso pleaseth God shall escape from her, but the wicked shall be taken by her" (vii. 26). "Though a sinner do evil an hundred times, and his days be prolonged, *yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God*" (viii. 12). Yes, he has found the power and the succour of this faith of his early years. That is why he says to you, "Know that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." That is why he bids you remember your Creator. It is not to deny you one innocent pleasure; it is not to make you gloomy, misanthropic, unsociable. It is to lead you to carry everywhere with you the thought of a love which

shall be as music in your heart, whatever labour may be given you or whatever sorrows may come.

This, it may be said, is a very simple, trite, elementary truth, but I venture to say it is one that is too much forgotten. Do we not need to make this the fundamental article of the religious teaching of the young? Ought we not to endeavour to stamp upon their hearts that old name of God, "Thou God seest me"? It is not long and laboured proofs and evidences; it is not abstruse lessons in theology. It is the appeal to the conscience, before the conscience has been seared. It is this: I am under the eye of God; God is my Creator; God loves me; God seeks my happiness; God is near to me, nearer than the air I breathe. I must live in his presence; I must give account to Him of every action; I cannot escape from Him if I would. "Thou hast made me and searched me out; Thou knowest my down-sitting and my uprising; Thou understandest my thoughts long before. Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?" Therefore, because Thou knowest my heart and my life, I will live as in Thy sight, and my prayer shall be, "Search me, O God, and seek the ground of my heart; prove me and examine my thoughts; and look well if there be any way of wickedness in me, and lead me in the way everlasting."

Will you still say, I am young; let me enjoy life; I will think about religion by-and-bye? That is a common delusion. Think about religion by-and-bye! Then you feel you must think about it some day. And you presume upon life, as if it were in your own command. Or you think that breathing out a prayer for forgiveness with your last breath, you shall obtain the forgiveness of God. But how do you know that you will have the opportunity, or that having it you will have the will? I do not limit the grace of God. But I know that our spirits, our hearts, our consciences, are governed by His everlasting laws as truly as the planets are ruled in their courses. And therefore we have no more right to expect that we can turn to God suddenly and become religious at any moment we please than the man who has squandered an estate has a right to think that he shall repair his error by becoming suddenly rich, or that one who has wasted the seed-time of his youth in idleness can become suddenly learned, or industrious, or wise. I repeat I do not limit the grace of God. He can change the heart of a sinner as He changed that of Saul of Tarsus or the robber on the cross. But such changes are the exception, and not the rule; and they at least had not wilfully resisted His call. But to make up our minds that we will follow our own self-devised course and yet cherish the hope that He will hereafter vouchsafe us repentance is surely to treat Him with something very like high-handed indignity. And even if He, of His infinite mercy, should give you

repentance, how bitter will it be! Think of the evil habits to be overcome. Think by how sharp and painful a process all those thick layers of evil which have gathered upon you must be cut away. Pride, and envy, and covetousness, and lust, and sensual desires, and unkind thoughts of others, and peevishness, and moroseness, and sloth, and coldness, and hardness of heart, and selfishness in a hundred different forms, all these things which required constant watching to prevent them from spreading like noxious weeds—all these, I say, through long neglect, have usurped the garden of the soul, and left no room for the fruits of the Spirit to grow. And now, when you would cultivate them, how hard is the task! How hard it is to begin late in life a habit of prayer, a habit of reading the Scriptures, a habit of self-examination, a habit of self-denial and self-sacrifice! And though God's blessed Spirit, Who bears marvelously with our long-continued provocation, may help us to make some progress, yet, alas! how slow it is! How often we are beaten back! How old vices return upon us, old sins haunt us, old frailties cling to us and with their tangled embrace cast us to the earth! Oh, depend upon it, if we would be ripe and mature Christians, if we would be happy Christians, we must begin early to give ourselves to God. If we would have a pure conscience, and a strong faith, and a clear hope, if we would save ourselves from bitter, bitter tears and a remorse which is agony, we shall remember our Creator in the days of our youth, before the evil days come in which we shall have no pleasure; before yet the sun, and the moon, and the stars be darkened, while the heart is still alive to all the influences of the outer world, and Nature gives back all her beauty and all her glory to the happy, beaming eye; when the clouds return not after rain—that is, when the worst sorrow is but a slight, passing shower, after which the face of heaven returns to its serenity with all the long, glad brightness of a summer's day. There is a time coming when all this shall be changed, when that body of thine, built like a stately palace, shall tremble to its fall. It may be glorious in the freshness of its beauty and in the goodness of its strength, but the hand of the spoiler shall rob it, and the strong pillars thereof shall be shaken, and they that look out of the windows shall be darkened. There is a time coming when the limbs and organs of the body shall refuse their office, when the voice shall be tuned to a childish treble, and the ears be dull of hearing, and when all the daughters of song shall be laid low, a wintry time, the loneliness whereof may be compared to that of the almond tree, the only tree which then blossoms, a state of feebleness like that of the locust which essays its first flight after it has shed its skin, before those days of decrepitude steal upon thee, remember thy Creator. Remember thy Creator before the silver cord is fretted away and loosened,

and the gilded lamp which hung by it falls and is dashed in pieces ; before the springs of life become useless, because the pitcher is broken at the fountain, and the wheel broken at the well ; before that last day when the dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God, Who gave it. Put not off till those days of darkness, and weariness, and approaching death the thought of God and a judgment to come. Cherish such thoughts now. Know that God will bring thee into judgment. "Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth." "Fear God and keep His commandments ; for this is the whole of man." Yes, this is the whole of man even now. The full light of the Gospel has not annulled this sentence ; it has only glorified it. There is indeed a fuller revelation of the love of God. There is a mightier motive of obedience. There is a more blessed remembrance. The Gospel says, Remember thy Creator, but it adds, Remember thy Redeemer. There is a love mightier than that even of creation, the love which shines from the Cross ; and hard indeed must be the heart which refuses to remember Him who died for us, and Who in dying asked to be remembered. With that remembrance our hearts shall grow warm. With that remembrance life shall be transfigured. Youth, manhood, old age, shall each be blessed, shall each shine with a new and a brighter glory. Trials shall lose their sharpness, sorrows shall grow sweet, joys shall be more enduring, and in the fear of God and the keeping of His commandments, life shall be rounded into the perfect orb that shall at last show forth all its beauty in the heavenly light.

VISCOUNT MOLESWORTH, rector of St. Petrock Minor, Cornwall, who was thrown from his horse when riding through Wadebridge, on Saturday week, and who was taken up in an insensible condition, is now progressing satisfactorily towards recovery.

MUCH is being made in some quarters of the statement that Dr. Walsham How accepted Wakefield because he could not agree with Dr. Temple's views as to the relative positions of a Diocesan and his Suffragan. We have reason, however, to believe that Dr. Walsham How cordially acquiesced in the view taken by Dr. Temple, much as it differed from that held by the late Bishop Jackson.—*Record*.

AT a meeting of the council of the East London Church Fund on Friday, the 24th ult., the following resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. R. Foster, seconded by the Rev. G. A. M. How :—"That this council desires to express to the Bishop of Bedford—Bishop-designate of Wakefield—the sense of great personal loss which they sustain in his removal from East London. They wish to record their thankfulness to God for the manifest blessing which has rested upon the Bishop's labours during the last (nearly) nine years, and to assure him of their constant prayers for himself and his work in his new diocese."

RUPTURE CURED!

IMPORTANT INVENTION.
MR. C. B. HARNESS, the renowned Inventor of Electropathic Belts and other Curative Electrical Appliances, has lately introduced a new **Washable Everlasting Truss**, known as **HARNESS' XYLONITE TRUSS**.

A NEW TRUSS. Guaranteed to last a lifetime. All who suffer from Rupture should wear **Harness' Xylonite TRUSS**. It has a beautifully smooth flesh-coloured surface, of a washable and durable material; gives complete comfort and support without irritation; is cheap; and weighs only a few ounces.

Pamphlet and Advice on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 3, 1888.

III.—DARWINISM AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

IN the third article the author treats of the position of man in the doctrine of evolution, and observes that this is generally felt to be the real difficulty. First, as touching his body. "Darwin's theory connects man with the higher *vertebrata* by analogies as strong as those which made other species descendants from a common stock. This was the secret of opposition to the origin of species." If, therefore, the evidence for descent with modification is true for all animals apart from man, it is true (according to Darwin) for man himself, for his body only differs in degree and not in kind ; still, as Professor Huxley says :—"The structural differences between man and even the highest apes. . . are great and significant. Every bone of a gorilla bears marks by which it might be distinguished from a corresponding bone of a man ; and in the present creation at any rate no intermediate link bridges over the gap between *Homo* and *Troglodytes*." The not uncommon statement that man was descended from apes is altogether untenable ; for what evolutionists maintain is that both apes and man have come from some common ancestral stock. They may be compared to the tops of the two branches of the letter Y, the stem being the common ancestor, and if the length of the arms represent *time*, the longer they are the greater do the species diverge.

But man is believed to be much more than animals, and it was here that Mr. Wallace and Mr. Darwin diverged ; for Mr. Wallace not only recognised man's brain to be greater and more complex than an ape's, but his intellectual superiority being

unmistakeably so, he thinks that "a higher intelligence" may have supervened to create man. To the Christian evolutionist this can only mean that while God saw fit to create all animals and plants by a process of gradual evolution, by methods He Himself implanted in them; yet, when man was to be created, these methods—sufficient for the rest of the animate world—required extra super-vention to form him and to impress upon him potentialities which could be developed into the powers he now exhibits among the most highly civilised and intellectual peoples.

Which is the most probable hypothesis must depend upon evidence. Mr. Wallace regards points in man's bodily structure as supporting his theory, such as the brain and hand. "If it be proved," he says, "that some intelligent power has guided or determined the development of man, then we may see indications of that power in facts which, by themselves, would not serve to prove its existence." In my work on "Evolution and Religion," I called attention to other facts, such as man being a geologically modern, yet a solitary genus, but cosmopolitan. This is opposed to the conditions of such among other animals, which, if they be isolated, are "survivals" of a lost and a numerous ancestry. The survivals too are mostly local, and not cosmopolitan. When we pass on to his intellectual capacities, they, of course, far transcend all the powers of animals. That the latter can reason requires no proof; but what I have elsewhere contended (and Mr. Romanes accepts the view), is that they have no power to make an abstract idea an object of thought, and so cannot reflect upon "pleasure," "pain," etc. Hence, too, they can be neither moral nor immoral.

This power is, at least, one of the very sharpest lines of demarcation between us and them. Some authors would regard "self-consciousness" as the basis of distinction. This, however, is only one example of an abstract thought—the conception of the *Ego*. But the power to have a self-consciousness lies behind it as well as all other abstractions, including the notion of a Deity. We speak of man's body, soul, and spirit; but while body and soul (*psyche*) are distinct and can be separated at death, spirit only represents the powers of mind, emotion, etc. Now whence came they? We may perhaps speculate as follows: We all observe how they are the natural outcome of its development in an infant, and are not specially created or infused into each child at some particular moment of its existence. Hence, on *a priori* grounds, we should infer that when the brain of man first attained to certain dimensions and convolutions; then, the intellectual and "spiritual" functions were an inevitable outcome too. In animals that defend themselves by their teeth, the jaw requires powerful temporal muscles. These necessitate deep depressions in the skull for attachment. These muscles prevent the expansion and development of

the brain. Conversely if the globular head of the young of some Miocene "simi-anthropoid" creature retained the spherical form characteristic of the young of living apes, which would allow of the expansion and development of the brain, we might thus get a possible clue to the origin of man's existing cephalic structures, and of his brain-powers. Whether this speculation be true or not, as the author of the articles observes as to his evolution, it matters little; for "man is now what he is," and no speculations as to how he came into existence, can affect one jot or one tittle his existing moral responsibilities. Instead of regarding an evolutionary origin of man as degrading, it testifies to his being the very highest of all God's developments upon earth. Placing man thus at the head of creation, as both Evolution and Genesis does, all nature-worship is thus rendered impossible. "If a man must have a visible God, he must worship himself" for all other creatures are lower than he.

Touching man's soul, the author observes: "If we believe that man as man is an immortal soul, though we cannot say when he became so, or that strictly speaking he ever did *become* so; we need not be surprised to meet the difficulties again in the evolution of man from the lower forms."

The author concludes with an interesting epitome of Mr. Darwin's views, shewing how they changed from a perfect acceptance of Paley's teleology to agnosticism, without his ever becoming an atheist at any time of his life. The final result our author defines as due to his "atrophy of faith."

He adds two brief postscripts: (1) "It may be asked, Then you are prepared to give up Genesis?" He and I answer "Yes," as far as the misused sense of theological opponents is concerned. (2) "How about the Fall?" His answer is: "The Fall implies a change, and a change for the worse in the relation of man as a 'living soul' to his Creator—God."

As I have already discussed these two matters at length in the PULPIT, and in my work, *Christian Beliefs Reconsidered*, I need add nothing further on the present occasion.

GEORGE HENSLOW.

FUNERAL REFORM.

AT a conference of the Church of England Burial Reform Association on the 23rd ult., the following letter from a firm of undertakers created considerable sensation. Mr. George Smith attended, and fully proved the assertions of his letter. It seems that, owing to provisions of the Burial Acts, the incumbents of the London parishes that own burial grounds receive a very large percentage of all the fees paid for interments in the London cemeteries; for instance, the rector of Marylebone receives 14 per cent., the vicar of Hampstead, 34 per cent., and the vicar of Pad-

dington, as much as 36 per cent. There can be no question but that such exorbitant fees (for as we understand, no services whatever are rendered) are a bar to the heavily-taxed ratepayers providing adequate burial grounds. It was quite right for the legislature to respect vested interests, and compensate the incumbents for the time being for loss of burial fees; but we see no justice in compensating all succeeding incumbents, some of whom derive large incomes from pew rents. Certainly it was impolitic and wrong to do so at the expense of the proper and decent burial of the dead, and of the health and satisfaction of the living. We trust that the Burial Reform Association will consider this important matter, and, if necessary, apply to the Government to amend the law.

10, Great Portland Street, W.,
February 20th, 1888.

SIR,—While agreeing with many of the propositions put forward to reduce the expenses of burial, we should like to call your attention to the charges made by the clergy, who as chief movers in this much-vexed question certainly do not appear to set an example by reducing or foregoing their fees. It is not generally known that many of the metropolitan cemeteries have to pay a commission or fee to the rector of the parish where the death took place, on each interment. The Rector of St. Marylebone, for instance, receives from 7s. 6d. to 1s. 6d. from the Kensal Green Cemetery Company (for no service whatever) on every interment of an inhabitant of that parish. In the published statement of the burial fees paid to the incumbent of the parish of St. John's, Hampstead, he received no less a sum than £918 9s. for the year ending Lady Day, 1887, this being of course in addition to other charges, etc., etc. On referring to some of the amounts we have paid from time to time to the rector and vicars of certain parishes, we find on two or three occasions we paid as much as £43, and in other instances upwards of £20 on each burial. We paid the rector of a church in Sussex a sum of 25 guineas for his *permission* to erect a memorial stone in the churchyard, and a further sum of 4 guineas because the family desired to have a dwarf railing. On another occasion a family residing in a district north-west of London wished the vicar of the church they were in the habit of attending to read the service at the funeral of one of their members. He wrote stating he would have no objection, but as he did not require any "fittings" (viz., hatband and gloves), his fee would be £3 3s., a sum far in excess of the usual charge for the so-called fittings, which are seldom or ever supplied now. This we thought was somewhat at variance with the maxim set forth by the Association, "that every part of the solemn rite of burial should be made a labour of love." We could quote many instances where the burial fee often exceeds the actual charge for the funeral. While acknowledging there was need of improvement in our funeral customs, we think the public should hear both sides of the question, and venture to suggest, the clergy before attempting to pluck out the mote in their brother's eye, should consider the same in their own.

GEORGE SMITH & SONS.

The Rev. F. Lawrence,
Hon. Sec. Reform Association.

THE LATE PROVOST OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

(Communicated.)

THE late Provost was a man of such varied learning, that his death may well be regarded as a serious loss to science, not only in Europe but throughout the world. To scientific societies and bodies, we may well leave his character. It will be safe in their hands. What he was as a Divine, is chiefly what we have to do with. It is generally a good rule only to praise the dead. But in religious questions, truth takes precedence even before charity.

The late Provost took so prominent a part in the Revision assault upon the Prayer Book, that it is impossible to touch upon the theological aspect of his character without glancing at questions which have been already freely discussed in these columns. Thus necessity obliges us to rake up the embers of an extinct volcano, if it be really and finally extinct.

The late Provost was decidedly a Broad Churchman. He took a leading part in our Revision Synod. We have all the votes from 1873 to 1877 before us; and we cannot find any point on which the late Provost opposed Revisionists, either as to the Baptismal services or the Presence, or the expurgation of the Athanasian Creed. He would not indeed allow the word priest to be wholly eliminated; but as it had been ruled to be only equivalent to Presbyter, this question was not of much consequence. The most striking matters were denying the Regeneration of Infants, as if it meant, or could mean, conversion; and the blotting from the Athanasian Creed the necessity of believing "rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is generally supposed that the late Provost not only approved the "Report of Master Brooke's Revision Committee," but had a principal part in drawing it up. A main object of this report was to get rid of the necessity of Priest and Bread in the Holy Eucharist. It rests on the 4th Rubric in "the Communion of the Sick," p. 15, as if that proved actual reception of the elements not obligatory. But Rome in the Sarum and Missal has the same Rubric: and no one can say that she does not require reception at the priest's hands. All she meant, and all that our Prayer Book necessarily means is, that God is not bound by the laws which He has imposed on us. The report says plainly that all the minister gives is the bread: "Who it is that gives the Body of Christ, we learn elsewhere . . . we address Almighty God as the Giver of the spiritual food by which we have been fed." "They who wrote" our formularies, "did not regard the person giving the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper as evidently the priest; but they looked upon that spiritual food as given after a heavenly and spiritual manner, even by the hands of the Great High Priest Himself through the operation of the Holy Ghost." Report, pp. 92, 93. This is all really too absurd, as if grace from God in heaven cannot be given by priest and with bread, as effectually as without their mediate use. One main object of this report was to make out that bread is not a means at all; but that faith is the only means, or vehicle between God and the recipient (p. 9). This is diametrically opposed to the Church Catechism, which makes the bread and wine a means whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace of the Holy Eucharist. On the report of the committee was founded the new question and answer, which are

taken from the Catechism and the 28th Article, with the intent of excluding priest and bread and wine, and making faith the sole vehicle between God and the soul.

"The ruling feeling of the late Provost, and of a large part of the Synod, was that Popish ritualism was in the air, and was coming upon the Irish Church. Sound churchmen of the Elrington and Todd school, thought this impossible. But we now see, from the prostrations in churches, the Trinity College Dublin guild, and utterances in our Church (?) papers, that the fears of the Provost and others were well founded. Their mistake was, that anything in the Prayer Book, Catechism, etc., favored a Romeward movement. The cry, "the Prayer Book is steeped in popery from cover to cover," which was heard, almost in the very Synod Hall, was utterly without foundation. It must have been this groundless misgiving as to the Prayer Book, which led the Revision Committee to eliminate, officiator, and bread, as generally necessary for the reception of eucharistic grace.

It is not long since the late Provost, as reported in the papers, stated that the first Provost was a Presbyterian. On what this was founded does not appear, as it is now said that Archbishop Loftus was the first Provost. However, it pleased the Presbyterian body. At the funeral, on invitation, a number of their ministers were present in gowns and hoods, in the College Chapel. This was the first appearance of the kind ever there made. No other dissenting ministers were invited or were present. This would look like making a difference between one class of non-episcopal ministers, and all others, on what appears to be very insufficient grounds. If the laity could start a ministry in the sixteenth century, why not now? And if mere Presbyterians can ordain, it seems curious that the power was not discovered till the time of Luther, Calvin and Knox. If the late Provost paid presbyterian ministers a compliment, they gratefully repaid it by their assembled numbers at his funeral.

Some time ago there was a meeting in Dublin to protest against retreats and sisterhoods. At that time, Dr. Jellett, not then Provost, made the astounding statement, that, if our Church did no longer protest, it would be nothing. He meant, of course, that its character would change; but a body does not cease to exist because it ceases to protest. But that is an old story now; and of late when the Provost's attention was called to a new guild in Trinity College, Dublin, enjoining clerical celibacy and compulsory confession, he utterly ignored it, and refused to say a word, to contradict the only Irish weekly Church paper, which asserted that the report was groundless, and that those who uttered it were little better than slanderers.

No doubt, the late Provost, who felt that if our Church was not Protestant it would be nothing, was silent about this guild, on what he thought sufficient reasons. Dr. Jellett doubtless felt that the responsibility of dealing with these questions rested upon the professors and lecturers in Divinity. Perhaps he thought this was merely a passing epidemic, which by opposition, or even notice, would only be intensified. Time will tell. There seems no sign of the thing dying out. If alarmists were left under the charge of being slanderers, through the silence of university authorities, they complain not. Let it turn out that the whole thing has vanished; they will be thankful. Even their own warning, groundless or not may have led to the Popish bubble bursting. However

all these things are now past, the late Provost did good work in his generation, and he has now gone to an account where our Judge will consider our infirmities, our intentions, and will order His sentence, not in strict justice, but in mercy. Well for us all, if we can give as good an account as the late Provost could. We should add that he was an eloquent and frequent occupier of the pulpit in the College Chapel; and that, as a public speaker, on loyal platforms, Dublin will find it very hard to supply his place. His voice was, we believe, also heard in our English cathedrals and University pulpits.

Many books were written in England, tracing the rise and progress of the Tractarian movement. There has been a movement in the Irish Church—also—an ebb and a subsequent spring tide. Some eras are favourable for taking note of progress. The late Provost's death seems one such. He saw the ebb, and he saw the returning tide. He could truly say *magna pars fui*. Our article has been intended as a sketch of what took place in his time. We have tried to handle his memory with all due tenderness, endeavouring to explain more the movements to and fro in themselves, than to lay blame on any individual, much less on him, whose loss the University, Dublin, Ireland, science, if not divinity itself, have much reason to deplore.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—Opinion has changed since I first addressed you on this subject in 1882.

Then, although evolution had received acceptance from the more advanced thinkers among scientific men, not a few of those who were most conspicuous in the scientific world withheld their assent; and the majority of religious people were altogether opposed to it.

Now, while it has received almost universal acceptance from men of science, very many also of the best men in theology recognise that it is consistent with far higher ideas of the origin and government of the world than were associated with the old notion of a special creation, which, occupying the Divine Architect for a period of six natural days, was followed by a seventh day, in which He rested from His labours.

The articles in the *Guardian*, which have been commented on by Mr. Henslow in the *PULPIT*, and those comments are alike signs of the times. I am not concerned to discuss what has been said by either, but one rejoices to recognise that the publication in the *Guardian* is good evidence that the old narrow dogmatism based on a literal interpretation of Genesis has broken down; and that the intolerance which resulted from it, has been succeeded by broader views and kindlier sympathies. You, Sir, from the first, with commendable liberality, gave opportunity for discussion of the question, and may, I think, congratulate yourself on the result.

It is not of course pretended that the acceptance of evolution removes all difficulties from our obtaining a right conception of the physical or moral world. It is far from doing that. On the contrary, it is still as true

as ever that the mystery of the world—its origin, its pleasures and pains, its virtues and vices, its struggles for the right, and its acceptances of the wrong, are all too deep for us to solve. The originating power, and the reason of that Power's specific action, are not to be learnt by man's investigation. But the two great stumbling blocks with many people—the enormous amount of suffering in the world, and the wrong doing,—are both, as it appears to me, somewhat explicable by a little consideration; and the latter all the easier by virtue of evolution.

As to the first, it will be seen at once that if the law of mutual slaughter had not obtained, the amount of life which it would have been possible to sustain in the world would have been no more than an imperceptible fraction of what now exists, or of what has existed for millions of generations, under and by virtue of that law. If then life has on the average ever so small an individual balance of happiness, as apparently both Mr. Huxley and Mr. Darwin believed, and as I think our own observation must confirm, the aggregate amount of happiness in excess of what would be otherwise possible, must be enormous. In the February number of the *Nineteenth Century*, Mr. Huxley observes: "There can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable person that mankind could, would, and in fact do get on fairly well with vastly less happiness, and far more misery than find their way into the lives of nine people out of ten." Further on he says: "Men with any manhood in them find life quite worth living under worse conditions than these," and again, "Pessimism is as little consistent with the facts as Optimism." Darwin, as quoted in his life, vol. 1, page 310, said in 1876: "According to my judgment happiness decidedly prevails," and "some other considerations moreover lead to the belief that all sentient beings have been formed so as to enjoy, as a general rule, happiness." To this general view I am pleased to see that Mr. Henslow subscribes. The resolute fight that everything and everybody (with rare exceptions), makes for life tends to support it.

So much may, I think, be said in correction or qualification of the idea of a miserable world. To many people the worse difficulty of a wicked one remains, though they will almost universally limit that difficulty to the race of mankind, denying to other creatures the capacity of good or evil. But surely if there be any truth in evolution, and if man has derived his physical existence through an ascending scale from the so-called brute creation, there need be no surprise if the instincts of the past cling around him and hamper his path. It could *not* be otherwise. Every nerve, every muscle, nay, every cell that composes his body must be conditioned by his antecedents, and he has to do battle with their proclivities. But if, as there is reason to believe, the discipline of life has throughout the ages tended not only to his intellectual, but to his moral improvement, the difficulty is more apparent than real. In relation to this, and to our incapacity to judge in many cases of the contest with evil, one may with advantage recall the lines of Burns:

Who made the heart, 'tis *He* alone
Decidedly can try us,
He knows each cord—its various tone,
Each spring—its various bias;
Then at the balance let's be mute,
We never can adjust it;
What's *done* we partly may compute,
But know not what's *resisted*.

It is sometimes argued that an all-wise and all-powerful God could have made the world without suffering and without sin, and therefore that, if He exists with those attributes, He cannot also be benevolent. This appears to me to be a presumptuous statement, based upon ignorance. We do not know what is, and what is not possible; but we can see as is before shown, that infinitely increased amounts of happiness are consistent with and probably dependent on a certain degree of suffering; and we all must recognise that if man were to be more than a mere automaton, he must have been constituted with that degree of free-will, which, whilst it alone could give him power to rise in the intellectual and moral scale, carried with it also, as of necessity, a capacity to do evil.

Fortunately, we are not called upon to solve these really insoluble problems. Our duty is a much simpler affair, and the more resolutely that is done the less will the problems trouble us. But their difficulty is certainly lessened rather than increased by the acceptance of evolution.

In conclusion, I may point out that there is not much reason to be surprised at the original disinclination to this doctrine. When we consider the strength of the inherited tendencies to accept, without challenge or reflection, the Genesis tale of creation as literal truth, we may indeed rather marvel at the extent of the variation that has taken place. From an evolutionary point of view this is extremely interesting to note, as it is apparently mainly due to the influences of a changed environment. However derived, let us hope that in the next generation or two, the variations will have become permanent, and that the desire to investigate rather than to take on trust will, in its turn also, be an inherited tendency.

H. W.

THE BREAD WHICH CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN.

SIR,—Does not all the difficulty found in the letters of your correspondents concerning John vi. 58, arise from forgetting the old canon respecting the "communicatio idiomatum" or *avridosis*? Our Lord is one Person and that Person Divine; the *ego* in Christ is His Divine hypostasis. When He assumed our nature, that nature was associated with, not absorbed into, the Divine. The union was not "by confusion of substance, but by unity of person." Hence some texts, from one point of view, speak of our Lord as Divine, others, from another point of view, as human, and some combine the two natures, but it is allowed in Scripture and taught by ecclesiastical writers that in speaking of the Person of Christ the attributes of the one nature, by the law referred to above, may be attributed to the other nature, as both belong to the same person; hence we have, "The Son of Man who is (*ὁ υἱ*) in heaven," that is, He who is the Son of Man has His proper sphere in heaven. "No man hath ascended into heaven but He that came down," etc. "The Bread of God that came down from heaven." "The Church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood." "The second man is the Lord from heaven." "Before Abraham was I am." I do not stop to discuss the question of various readings; they may be found in most critical commentaries.

Among Church writers I just name one or two that

come first to hand. Ignatius in Eph. ii. has "*αἱματι Θεοῦ*," "by the blood of God"; in Rom. vi., *τοῦ πᾶθους τοῦ Θεοῦ μου*, "of the suffering of my God." Clement of Rome, a still earlier authority, has something of the same sort in 1 Ep. ii. Tertullian has *sanguine Dei*. Does not one of your correspondents adopt the theory of the *Adam Radmon*, which, having its rise in pre-Christian times, has passed into various modifications through some ancient heresies, and re-appeared in Quakerism, Swedenborgianism, and other fantastic schools of thought? The old Church canon of interpretation will satisfactorily explain, so far as such a mystery can be explained, all difficulties.

F. T. BASSETT,

Prebendary of Wells and Vicar of Dulverton.

SIR,—I thank "Medicus" for his courteous letter. Mr. Lawrence refers me to the note on John iii. 13, to the effect that the words "which is in heaven" are not found in many ancient authors. I do not see how this affects our argument, though it knocks aside the reasoning founded on these words by Ritualists, to the effect that our Lord's Body may be corporally in more places than one. Mr. Lawrence asks how Pearson condemns his theory without enumerating it amongst heresies, old or new, I answer because his exhaustive condemnation would include his idea if it had ever occurred to any one before him.

What C. G. Gordon meant by the Incarnation of Holy Spirit in the believers, is beyond my powers of comprehension. All attempts at confusing or mixing body and spirit must fail, because the two things are totally distinct.

If Mr. Lawrence says that our Lord's Body was brought to the Virgin by the Holy Ghost, he seems to contradict that His Body was born of the Virgin at Bethlehem. This seems too plain to be confused by any mystification.

I do not think our Lord in St. John vi. makes Himself and His flesh the same; and thus Rome errs because she explains "This is my body," to mean "flesh, bones, soul, and divinity."

Perhaps I was hasty in saying that Pearson did not detect Mr. Lawrence's theory in any former heresies: for on looking again I find what seems identical with it in Smalcus—"we affirm that the power of God either infused into the womb of the Virgin some created substance, or there created it, from which, joined with that which came from the substance of the Virgin herself, a true man was formed."—Pearson p. 244.

Note.—Pearson says: "We must not believe that He (the Holy Ghost) formed any part of His (our Lord's) flesh of any other substance than of the Virgin; for certainly He was of the fathers according to the flesh, and was *as to that* truly and *totally* the son of David and Abraham."

Ibid. 243. How could our Lord's flesh be totally of David and Abraham, if His body was first born or created in Heaven, and then conveyed to the Virgin to Bethlehem?

Pearson again says, "they," the Socinians, "have made a body of Christ, partly descending from the Father, partly not; and whereas as man He is like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, they have invented a body, partly like ours, partly not, and so in no part totally like."—p. 244, note.

May I ask Mr. Lawrence what he means by what he quotes from C. G. Gordon about the Incarnation

of the Holy Ghost in the heart of believers? Does this mean that the Holy Ghost as flesh enters into our hearts? What else does Incarnation mean? I must say, one would suppose this is what he has in his mind, for he compares it to the Holy Ghost bringing down our Lord's body from heaven and imparting it to the Virgin. All I can say is, that one absurd impossibility is very fairly compared with another. At the same time I wish to speak of Mr. Lawrence with all respect; but his theory really requires to be thus described.

INQUIRENS.

A SAD CASE.

SIR,—May I plead with your readers for the unhappy man who was recently brought before Mr. D'Eyncourt for begging in clerical costume, and drunkenness? He has been a dipsomaniac over thirty years, having an inherited craving for drink, and is now sixty-one years of age. From curacy to curacy he flitted at short intervals under distressing circumstances, the last licence he held being granted by Bishop Sumner, in 1861, to All Saints', Lambeth, where my father, then incumbent, tried everything that moral persuasion could suggest; but at length he committed himself publicly, and was obliged to be dismissed. Since then I have watched his downward career with pain, and was surprised to learn that he had never been under control for longer than seven months continuously. This is much to be regretted, since it has rendered the large amount of help he has received powerless to effect a cure. He now requires to be under supervision for five years, if this object is to be attained. This is the verdict of several, both physicians and others, fully competent to judge, and who are well acquainted with the case. As a first step, I got the licensee of one of the homes for inebriates certified under the *Habitual Drunkards' Act* to receive him, at the reduced payment of three guineas a week. I then asked a wealthy gentleman to sign the requisite undertaking for payment, which he very kindly did, being convinced that the man ought not to be at large to continue a moral suicide, a pest to society, and a disgrace to his friends, in addition to bringing the Church into disrepute, by posing as a destitute clergyman in need of alms, which he is not, having abjured his orders in 1885, when he was received into the Church of Rome. This fact he is anxious to conceal, since his oldest and tried friends are to be found in the Church of England; but he need not be so; for his case has long passed from the limit of clerical discipline to the far wider sphere of humanity, sole and simple, and from the Bishop of Rochester and the Bishop designate of Wakefield down to your humble servant, there are scores of clergymen who are willing to help him, provided he submit to proper control. Before leaving court he signed the legal form relinquishing his liberty under the provisions of the Act for one year, and then Mr. D'Eyncourt delivered him into my custody to take him to the home, where he is being well cared for in every respect. To provide for his maintenance I am now getting subscriptions together, and acting as hon. secretary. It must be distinctly understood that this money will not in any way be under his own control; but will be paid into the Imperial Bank, 1, Sydney Place, Onslow Square, to the "Inebriates' Account," and should be sent to the hon. treasurer, Rev.

H. Webb-Peploe, 25, Onslow Gardens, London, S.W., mentioning the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT. The Bishop designate of Wakefield has headed the list of subscriptions. Those received through these columns will be duly acknowledged therein. My coadjutor as hon. secretary is the Rev. H. B. Chapman, vicar of St. Luke's, Camberwell, 177, Camden Grove North, Peckham, S.E., and the future disposal of the patient will be submitted to a quasi-committee, consisting of some leaders of the temperance movement, who have manifested a deep interest in the case, in addition to the gentlemen referred to above.

JOHN NAPLETON.

Wymington Rectory, Higham Ferrers.

FUNERAL REFORM.

"My flesh shall rest in hope—for why—"

SIR,—I. In reference to the disposal of the *cadaver* or corpse of man, the system of the Egyptians was an attempt to secure for it a preservation made absolute by chemical appliances, and by a fenced-in seclusion.

2. Opposite to this was its violent and immediate destruction on the funereal pyre, of which Virgil has sung.

3. The tree-depositing system of the North-Pacific Indians is due to the dangers of interment arising from wolves, etc., and is only possible, without certain risk to life, under the nomadic conditions of human development.

4. The lead and timber coffin, and bricked-in recess or sarcophagus system, which the English so largely use, obviously differs from the first, second and third of these, but has evils both peculiar to itself and common to some of the others, particularly to the third system. Of the former, one may name its great monetary cost, and of the latter sort its insalubrious character. This latter goes far beyond the danger of the tree-deposit system, for the simple reason that the gases are evolved in the one case more rapidly as well as dissipated more extensively and at higher levels above the air we breathe than in the other. Of this latter danger, well do I remember the case of such a coffin in brick recess interment, under the low window of an old church, and how some time after the clergyman at evening prayer beside me lost his sight and got quite faint, until I opened a door and let in a strong draught of pure air, which beat back the foul, and restored his failing consciousness.

5. The question then arises still, What is the best thing for us to do with the *cadaver*, at once relatively to these other systems, and positively in itself, all things being duly considered? Let the chemical scientists first be heard. This is common sense, this is mercy, this is respectful alike to the living as to the dead, above all to the relatives, stunned by the blow, and beset by the vulture undertakers. Now, if chemical science propounds as a fact (resting at the very foundation of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, and of their mutual relations, all the world over), that the gases evolved by decomposition, if allowed to pass off freely into contiguous earth, do forthwith enter into new combinations and form fresh affinities, which entirely neutralise them and rob them of their qualities dangerous to animal, though becoming thus the proper food of vegetable life, we ask, *why then go a step further?* This is safe for the survivors and decent to the dead, and does not exhibit or effect a

process wrought upon the dead at once extremely agonising to the feelings of the survivors and needlessly as well as ostentatiously officious and hostile in respect of that body, which in life and time was at once the triumph of divine workmanship in its origin, and "the temple of the Holy Ghost" in its Christian career. And indeed one may remember that the "cophinus," whence "coffin," was just such a fragile and rapidly consuming basket of willows, as the "*papier maché*" receptacle now suggested, at once adequate for safe removal, and certain of brief obstruction from contact of the corpse with mother earth. And is not this again the old word to Adam, "Out of it wast thou taken, into it shalt thou be turned"? Earth then is the natural and proper womb, ordained and provided by God, into which man's body shall enter the second time to be in due season born again, when "God giveth it a body as it pleaseth Him, and to every seed his own body." Now, surely, this system meets all the conditions and reconciles all the relations of the parties concerned. And it is in view of this old, true, wise, humane, devout, and absolutely hygienic method, that it is earnestly hoped funeral reform may be soon carried out. "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," is but the principle propounded of a reverend and merciful and tender and hopeful resort to God's own operative laboratory, in which Christians deposit their dead ones, and from which these dead ones shall emerge, with all that constitutes their full personal identity, in "the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting." Here as elsewhere Scripture and science are at one, had we the sense to see it.

PHILIP DWYER, A.M.

THE POTTER AND THE CLAY.

[See Romans ix. 19, 24.]

WHY hast Thou made me so,
My Maker? I would know
Wherefore Thou gav'st me such a mournful dower;—
Knowledge that deepens pain,
Toil that is oft in vain,
And longing to be pure without the power?
"Shall the thing formed aspire
The purpose to require
Of Him who formed it?" Make not answer thus!
Beyond the Potter's wheel
There lieth an appeal
To Him who breathed the breath of life in us.
When the same Power that made
My being, has arrayed
Its nature with a dower of sin and woe,
And thoughts that question all;—
Why should the words appal
That ask the Maker why He made me so?
I know we are but clay,
Thus moulded to display
His wisdom and His power who rolls the years;
Whose wheel is Heaven and earth;—
Its motion, death and birth;—
Is Potter, then, the name that most endears?
To Him we bow as King;
As Lord His praise we sing;
To Him we pray as Father and as God;
Saviour in our distress;
Guide through the wilderness;
And Judge that beareth an avenging rod.

I grudge not, Lord, to be
Of meanest use to Thee ;—
Make me a trough for swine if so Thou wilt ;—
But if my vessel's clay
Be marred and thrown away
Before it takes its form, is mine the guilt ?

I trust Thee to the end,
Creator, Saviour, Friend,
Whatever name Thou deignest that we call.
Art not Thou good and just ?
I wait and watch, and trust
That Love is still Thy holiest name of all.

I watch and strive all night ;
And when the morning's light
Shines on the path I travelled here below :—
When day eternal breaks,
And life immortal wakes,
Then wilt Thou tell me why Thou mad'st me so.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

THE Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has appointed the Rev. Charles Griffiths, for nine years chaplain to the Missions to Seamen at Bristol, to the important vicarage of St. Paul's, Bedminster. During the last nine years Mr. Griffiths has for every sitting in the Seamen's Church enrolled forty seamen, fishermen, and bargemen, besides members of their families, as abstaining members of the Missions to Seamen branch of the Church of England Temperance Society, and has sold to them fourteen Bibles and Prayer-books for every sitting. An average of twenty-six seamen of various creeds daily attended the week-day morning services ; whilst ninety-eight deep sea Missions are being carried on in all parts of the world by captains, officers, and seamen selected and supervised by Mr. Griffiths. The Bishop held a confirmation at the Seamen's Church last year, at which seventy-four sailors or their families were presented. The offerings for the year, though sailors ashore are generally out of work and of wages, amounted to £140 17s. 6d. The whole character of the sailors' quarter in Bristol has been revolutionised, their boarding-houses reformed, twenty-two public-houses, frequented by sailors, have disappeared, and the value of the property enhanced by the labours of Mr. Griffiths and the Missions to Seamen staff attached to the Seamen's Church at Bristol.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alford, Rev. Allan Cameron, M.A., Vicar of Nether Winchendon, Bucks.
Ard, Rev. A. J., Vicar of St. Saviour's, Hanley Road, Crouch Hill.
Baddeley, Rev. Edmund, M.A., Rector of Long Marston, York.
Barber, Rev. R. H., Chaplain of Shrewsbury Prison.
Burrows, Rev. L. H., Vicar of Wreclesham, Vicar of Godalming, Surrey.
Collins, Rev. George Grantham, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Ripon.
Davies, Rev. D. Grimaldi, Vicar of Welshpool ; Surrogate for the Diocese of St. Asaph.
Davis, Rev. Charles, B.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Leicester ; Organising Secretary of the Church Parochial Mission Society.
Dunn, Rev. R., Vicar of Brimpton, near Reading ; Vicar of St. John's, Newbury.
Edwards, Rev. W. C., M.A., Rector of Llandysilio, Anglesey ; Rector of Llanystumdwy, Carnarvonshire.

Evans, Rev. John, late Vicar of Llansaintffread ; Vicar of Llandeloy-with-Llanhowell, Pembrokeshire.
Griffiths, Rev. Charles, Chaplain to the Missions to Seamen at Bristol ; Vicar of St. Paul's, Bedminster.
Gwynne, Rev. Charles Brooke, Curate of Timperley ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Michael's District, Christ Church, Cloughton.
Hall, Rev. George Mellish James, B.A., Vicar of Pishill, Oxon.
Henry, Rev. James, Clerical Secretary of the London Association in Aid of Moravian Missions ; Association Secretary for the West Midland District of the Church Pastoral Aid Society.
Jones, Rev. David, B.A., late Curate of Lampeter, Cardigan-shire ; Vicar of Kidwelly, Carmarthenshire.
Jones, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Mold ; Surrogate for the Diocese of St. Asaph.
Knowles, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Workington ; Vicar of Christ Church, Cockermouth.
Lane, Rev. Ernald, M.A., Rector of Leigh ; Archdeacon of Stoke.
Milroy, Rev. Andrew W., Preacher of the Rolls Chapel, Chancery Lane, and Rector of Newnham, near Winckfield, Hants ; Vicar of St. Mary's, West Cowes, Isle of Wight.
Pitt, Rev. George Lewis, B.A., Curate of Cirencester ; Vicar of Acton Turville.
Pryse, Rev. Edward, Rector of Nevin ; Rector of Bodedern, Anglesey.
Sayres, Rev. E. H. C., M.A., Rector of Cold Ashton, Gloucestershire.
Sharpin, Rev. F. Lloyd, M.A., Archdeacon of Bombay ; Rector of Millbrook, Beds.
Steele, Rev. W. F., Vicar of St. Andrew, Montpelier ; Surrogate of the Consistory Court of Bristol.
Stukeley, Rev. Edward Charles, B.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Ripon.
Tabourdin, Rev. Richard, M.A., Senior Minor Canon of Windsor ; Vicar of Twickenham.
Thorpe, Rev. W., Curate-in-Charge of Tarrant Gunville, Dorset.
Venables, Rev. Canon, late Vicar of Great Yarmouth ; Rector of Burgh Castle, Norfolk.
Weir, Rev. D. W., Vicar of Thurlby, near Bourne, Lincolnshire.
Williams, Rev. H. L., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bingley ; Vicar of Bleasby, Nottinghamshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Badger, Rev. George Percy, D.C.L., late Chaplain Bombay Presidency, at 21, Leamington Road Villas, Westbourne Park, on the 21st ult., aged 72.
Baker, Rev. Charles Francis, M.A., Rector of Tellisford, at Tellisford Rectory, on the 22nd ult., aged 70.
Constable, Rev. John Nicholson, M.A., of Bevertown and Mullinahone, and Rector of Kilconduff, at Swinford Rectory, county Mayo, Ireland, on the 21st ult., aged 67.
Fell, Rev. John Edward, Rector of Sheepy, Atherstone, at Bournemouthe, on the 23rd ult., aged 74.
Hoare, Rev. William Henry, M.A., at Oakfield Crawley, on the 22nd ult., aged 78.
Loftus, Rev. William, M.A., at East Tytherley Vicarage, Hants, on the 26th ult., aged 65.
Partington, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Netherfield, at Netherfield Vicarage, Battle, on the 25th ult., aged 47.
Robinson, Rev. James Hastings, late Curate of Claybrooke, Leicestershire, at Westham, Sussex, on the 15th ult., aged 27.
Rogers, Rev. T. P., M.A., Christ Church, Oxford, suddenly, at Batheaston Vicarage, on the 23rd ult., aged 67.
Scott, Rev. William Langston, M.A., for twenty-five years Vicar of Dunmow, at Dunmow Vicarage, Essex, on the 22nd ult., in his 71st year.
Storr, Rev. Francis, for thirty-four years Vicar of Brenchley, at Brenchley Vicarage on the 22nd ult., aged 79.
Story, Rev. William, of Corick Clogher, county Tyrone, sometime Rector of Aghaboy, at 24, Lower Baggot Street, Dublin, on the 9th ult., aged 83.
Walker, Rev. Robert Peard, of Wolverhampton, at Dunedin, New Zealand, of typhoid fever, on Jan. 5th, aged 26.
Young, Rev. H. Tufnell, at Mallards Court, Stokenchurch, on the 24th ult., aged 77.



The Church of England Pulpit.

"THE GIFT OF GOD."

BY THE VENERABLE WILLIAM E. MEADE, D.D.,
ARCHDEACON OF ARMAGH AND RECTOR OF
ARDTREA, CO. TYRONE.

AN ORDINATION SERMON PREACHED IN THE
CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK, ARMAGH,
ON SUNDAY, DECEMBER 18TH, 1887.

"Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands."—2 TIM. i. 6.

WHEN our Blessed Lord went up on high He "received gifts for men," and we know how, upon the great day of Pentecost, He poured out His Spirit upon His Church, and we believe that since that day the gift of the Spirit is ever given to the earnest, faithful, loving, praying soul, to help it in the work of God.

Whatever our calling is—whether we are rich or poor—whether we are high or low—whether we are ministers or people—let us do our work with loving hearts—let us do it in God's name, and for God, and He will give us His Blessed Spirit richly, according to our needs.

I. Now you know that to-day our thoughts are especially directed to those who are called by God to be the ministers of Christ and stewards of His mysteries; and we learn from our text, what we would indeed have otherwise believed, that when God calls them, when they are set apart for the ministry, when the Bishop's hands are laid upon them, they receive from God a special gift for their work. From the earliest time, some men have been chosen from amongst their brethren for this work of the ministry. They have to conduct the public worship of the Church, to preach the Word, and to administer the Sacraments. Aye, and they are called to a far more difficult work than these—they have to deal with individual souls, to warn the sinful, to encourage the desponding, to comfort the sorrowful, to point the dying towards the Cross. Ah! that is indeed a hard and difficult work, the dealing with souls. Can our words turn the sinner from the error of his ways? Can our words soften the hard heart? Can they strengthen the weak, comfort the sorrowful? Nay, brethren, we know that it is not so. It is God alone who can change the heart. Paul may plant and Apollos may water, but it is God alone who gives the increase. We are nothing, God is everything. We are but instruments in His hands, "yet not I,

but the grace of God which was with me." I dare not speak to you from this place, I dare not administer the sacraments, I dare not rebuke or exhort the sinful soul, were it not that I believe that I have been called of God, and that if I am only faithful He gives me the gift of the Spirit for the work to which He has called me.

1. Just now you will hear this question addressed to those who are about to be admitted to the Diaconate, "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration, to serve God for the promoting of His glory and the edifying of His Church?" And why do those about to be ordained answer, "I trust so"? Why did any of us answer thus the question addressed to us? Was it not because we felt the love of God in our hearts, because we desired most earnestly to see Him, because we longed most eagerly to set forth before men Jesus Christ and Him crucified, and because we believed that we could serve Him best and most faithfully in the ministry of the Church? Yes, that was the inward witness which God gave us—that love for Him and for human souls. But there was also something outward corresponding to this inward witness. The ministry was no sudden thought to us. We had perhaps been brought up with this idea in our minds. We knew that it was our parents' wish; we had been sent to college with that intention. We were from our childhood the children of prayer. Or it may have been that no thought of the ministry came into our minds until some thrilling words touched our hearts, or some great sorrow made us feel the littleness of time and the greatness of eternity; and then we were led by God's guiding hand, and knew that we were called to serve Him in the sacred ministry of His Word and Sacraments.

2. And again, just now, as the bishops and the presbyters lay their hands on the heads of those who are to be ordained priests, you will hear these solemn words, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands." How dare we use such words as these? How do we know that they are not vain words? It is, brethren, because we believe that God is faithful and true—There shall be given the Holy Spirit to them that ask for it with faithful and loving hearts—and that as it was with Timothy, so it is now with those who are called to the ministry, they receive with the laying on of hands the special gift of God—the grace which they need for their work. As when the anointing oil was poured on David's head, he received the gift of the Spirit which was needful for a king, so, when with humble and faithful hearts we kneel before the bishop, and his hands and those of the presbyters are laid on us, we believe that we receive the gift of the Spirit which we need for our work as priests in the Church of God. And we believe that that

gift is with us still, because still we feel the love of God in our hearts, still our joy is in the preaching of His word, still our earnest prayer is for the salvation of the souls of our people. And to this inward witness there is also something which corresponds outwardly. We are not slothful servants and our ministry is not unbled. We are indeed weak and sinful; the gift is in earthen vessels; often our words seem to be in vain. There are some who regard not the words which are spoken, who have no love for us or for our Master. But we know that it was so even with the Blessed Lord Himself; it was so with His holy apostles; and so we labour on, and here and there, now and then, God vouchsafes some token that He is with us, that words spoken for Him are not spoken in vain. It is perhaps in the hour of bitter repentance that some sinful soul reminds us of words which we have almost forgotten; or as we kneel by the dying bed, and see the wan face lit up with the smile of faith, we know that God does make use of us for the salvation of souls, and then we are drawn nearer to our dear people, and we feel that they are indeed our hope and our joy and our crown of rejoicing in the Lord.

II. But the gift of the Spirit is not for ministers alone—not for bishops, priests, and deacons alone—it is for all God's people. There is a priesthood of the laity. "He hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father"; ye are "a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." You are called not indeed to the public preaching of the word, nor to the ministry of the sacraments, but you are called to draw near to the throne of Grace, to offer up the spiritual sacrifices of prayer, and praise, and thanksgiving, to set before men by word and deed the Christian life, to "present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." Yes, you cannot doubt it, that is your call, that is the call of every Christian man and woman. To offer the sacrifice of prayer, to live the life of Christ, and you cannot doubt it that as you have received the call, so you have been given the grace. True there are many faithless Christians who never stir up the gift, who allow it to lie fruitless, useless in their souls, aye, and I am afraid that there are some faithless ministers too, who do not stir up the gift of God which is given to them with the laying on of hands. But, surely it is not so with thee, thou priest of the living God, thou feelest the inward call, thou feelest the surpassing love of God deep down in thine heart, thou art drawn towards the Blessed Saviour with the bonds of love, when thou seest the sorrowful face and the outstretched arms, a love that passeth knowledge layeth hold of thee, thou kneelest down and offerest up the sacrifice of prayer and praise, of soul and body. That is the inward witness, this love in thine heart; but there is something corre-

sponding to this also in thine outward life; thou art living in peace and love and charity with thy neighbours; constant in all the ordinances of religion; a man of prayer, but also a man of peace and love.

Brethren, doubt it not. The gift of the Spirit is for you and for your children, and for them that are afar off. In every trial, in every danger, in every difficulty, draw near to the altar, offer the sacrifice, and doubt it not the incense will go up to heaven. It will be a sweet-smelling savour in the sight of God, and the answer will come down in showers of blessing upon your heads.

III. Now one word to those who are this day to be called to this holy office and ministration.

Brethren, we are sure that you have weighed well those words which you are about to speak to-day, that you have been inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office, that you do feel the love of Christ in your hearts, that your earnest desire is by life and conversation to set forth Christ and Him crucified; that it is love for God and love for human souls and no other motive which now makes you seek to enter the ministry of the Church. And we believe also that to-day you will receive the gift of the Spirit, which is needful for your work. But then we know also that when you go forth into the world, you will have to face many a danger, encounter many a foe. There will be fears within and fightings without. Sloth perhaps, or pride, or indolence in your own hearts. Carelessness it may be, or indifference, or perhaps even opposition in the world without you. What is your hope, then? How can you prevail? Your hope is in the gift of God, your strength is in the power of the Holy Ghost in your heart. Yes, let that give you courage in the hour of danger, let that give you strength in the hour of weakness. You have been called and sent by God, and when He gives the call, He gives also the power. "Stir up,—quicken, re-ignite,—the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of hands."

As you kneel by the dying bed, as you rebuke the sinful, as you preach the word, let this thought never be absent from your mind—I am God's minister, called and set apart for this very office. And then surely, brethren, this thought that you are called of God, will not make you proud or boastful. Nay, it will make you gentle and humble and merciful and forgiving, for you will feel how unworthy you are to serve in the lowest place, or yourself a sinner to speak to sinful men about their souls.

And now let us all take our part in this service to-day. Those to be ordained are commended to our prayers. Away, then, with wandering thoughts; away with all thoughts of the world or the flesh. Let us all offer up the sacrifice of prayer. Let us all pray to the great Head of the Church that He will pour out His Spirit upon these His servants, and let us be sure of this, that

our prayers will be answered, and that as He has given them the good desire, so He will also give them the grace and the power to be true and faithful, patient and loving, ministers of His Holy Word and of His blessed Sacraments.

REGENERATION AND CONVERSION.

BY THE REV. AUBREY L. MOORE, M.A., HON.
CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, AND TUTOR OF
KEBLE AND MAGDALEN COLLEGES, OXFORD.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE UNIVERSITY CHURCH
OF S. MARY'S, OXFORD, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY
29TH, 1888.

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus."—ROMANS viii. 1.

"If any man be in Christ he is a new creature."—2 COR. v. 17.

"ARE you converted?" "Have you found a Saviour?" "Are you at peace with God?" These are some of the questions, or rather different forms of the great question, which for some men is the be-all and end-all of theology and religion too. The question, no doubt, is more often, at least in these forms, heard from those Christians who are not members of our Communion, but when it is asked in all earnestness and Christian charity, it seems to have a wonderful power over men, a power which would be simply unintelligible if the question itself did not somehow appeal to the spiritual life, and needs of men. Some three or four years ago we witnessed this in those remarkable gatherings when two so-called "Evangelists" were endeavouring to bring this question home to men, educated and uneducated, in the very heart of Oxford. One-sided their teaching may have been, imperfect their theology certainly was, and yet their influence was felt not only by those who were living a careless or godless life, but by some who had, and used, the privileges of our own Church. And to them this teaching of Conversion and peace with God, especially in the form in which it was given, seemed hard to bring into relation with the other facts of their spiritual life, and above all with the sacramental teaching of the Church of Christ.

It seemed to me, then, that it might be helpful not only to individuals, but to the great cause of Christian unity, if I were to try and put before you some thoughts as to what "Conversion" is, and what is its place in the spiritual life."

We can hardly have failed to notice that this matter of Conversion is far more rarely preached about in the pulpits of the Church of England than among the Christian sects, and more than this, that the more prominent the fact of Baptismal Regeneration is in any teacher's theology, the more does the fact of Conversion recede into obscurity.

There are some people who think that to preach "Conversion" is to declare oneself half a Dissenter, and anything "Dissenterish" is unworthy of the consideration of members of the Catholic Church.

There are others who, seeing that the preaching of Conversion is almost monopolised by those whose system they hold to be unphilosophical, and sectarian, take no further interest in the matter, though they see it stirring to their very depths the hearts of many who have never been attracted by the more complete teaching of the Church.

Others, again, while they are compelled, as it were under their breath, to admit the fact of Conversion, are not able to reconcile it with the faith in which they have been brought up, and so it exists for them as a "skeleton in the cupboard," haunting them, and at times even making them ask whether after all there are not some sides of spiritual truth which the Church has failed to grasp.

And others, again, are repelled because they see that associated with the teaching of Conversion, if not necessarily connected with it, are doctrines which, judged by the standard of the Church and the Bible, are heretical and untrue, and, therefore, they keep far from dangerous ground.

Now my object this evening is to try and show what Conversion is and what it is not, and, if God will, to lead you to the conclusion that it is neither Dissenterish nor unphilosophical, nor heretical in its tendency, nor out of relation with the facts of our spiritual life, nor without a close parallel in the intellectual and moral spheres. More than that, Conversion, I believe, if we understand it rightly, is necessary in the spiritual history of every one who is spared to the age of free responsible life.

I. Conversion has two clearly-defined senses. It may mean (i.), the turning of the soul to God in one turned away from Him; or (ii.), the entire conformation of the whole soul to God.

In the second sense it is a lifelong process which, even at death, is incomplete. Clearly this is not Conversion in the sense with which we are at present concerned. It is rather the whole growth in grace, the gradual becoming like to Christ's image which some call sanctification in contradistinction from justification. It is the learning to see things as God sees them, to love as He loves, to hate as He hates. It is the analogue of that intellectual Conversion from the seeming to the true, which Plato describes in his well-known allegory of the prisoners in the cave. "It is not the spinning round of a shell," he says, "it is the conversion of a soul."

The other sense of Conversion is the one with which we are now concerned. In this sense Conversion is something which we feel to be necessary

except for those who die in infancy, and which yet it does not seem easy to fit in with the facts of our spiritual life.

II. What is its relation to the great baptismal gift of regeneration? The answer to that question carries with it the answer to all the others. For 1,500 years Regeneration and the gift of Holy Baptism were convertible terms. The regenerate were the baptised, and the baptised were the regenerate. But in the 16th century there arose men who, under the influence of reaction from the formal and unreal teaching of their day, and fearing lest human merit should interfere with the work of God, denied the freedom of the will and thereby destroyed the distinction between Regeneration and Conversion. The heresies of Zwingli and of Calvin never drew the Church of England away from the truth of Christ in this matter, but they sufficed to confuse men and make them fail to understand her terminology. You have only to turn to our Baptismal Service or to the Article on Original Sin, to see that the Church of England through all its changes has held fast the truth that Baptism was the washing of Regeneration. On Conversion, so far as I know, she has given no formal decision, but it is not difficult to see what Conversion means, if only we can keep clear of the false meaning read into the ecclesiastical term Regeneration. Regeneration is not Conversion, nor is Conversion Regeneration. Nor are they associated in time, nor do they follow one another in any given order. St. Paul, whose conversion we celebrated last week, was converted before he was regenerated, and it never occurred to him or to Ananias that Conversion would do instead of Baptism. Christian children are regenerated before they are converted. To talk of a converted infant is an absurdity, it is a contradiction in terms. "Seeing now this child is regenerate," expresses the unvarying faith of the Church of Christ. And there is something at least of unreality, I had almost said dishonesty, in the attempt to resolve the one into the other. "Seeing now this child is by baptism regenerate" cannot really mean "Seeing now that we hope that this child will one day be converted if it lives."

What then is Regeneration or the new birth? It is wholly the act of God, as much as creation is. It is His free gift, which children receive as they receive the gift of natural life. Conversion, on the other hand, implies the conscious act of a responsible being, enabled by the grace of God. Regeneration is the restoration of man's common nature; Conversion the acquiescence of each single heart in the perfect law of the Divine will. "Regeneration is the specific gift of the Gospel, the new birth of which prophets obscurely spoke, and which was given in the fulness of time; Conversion is that turning in man's individual being, whereby his will is altered, and in place of the

love of sin comes the love of holiness." The regeneration of collective manhood was the work of the Incarnation, in which man had and could have no part. Humanity which had fallen was by that act taken into God, and the Sacrament of Baptism ingrafts the individual man into the perfect Humanity of Christ. Hence, in the two passages in Holy Scripture, where the word Regeneration is used, it applies first to the consummation of the Kingdom of Christ, which His Incarnation began, and secondly to Holy Baptism, "whereby as by an instrument," we are made members of it. But by this act of God's love our freedom, our responsibility, is not taken away. The child who does not yet know good from evil receives that gift unconsciously. He can impose no barrier. The adult can, and therefore in adult Baptism Conversion must precede Regeneration—there must be, that is, a conscious willingness to surrender the life to God, as there was in St. Paul, if the gift of pardon, and with it the infusion of grace, is to be received. It is one thing to come to Holy Baptism to have "the wound of human nature" healed. It is another to approach that Sacrament with a burden of unrepented sin upon the soul. The one is in simple faith to obey God's call; the other is to come to God "with a lie in our right hand."

The case of adult Baptism in a Christian country is comparatively rare, and in theory at least the relation of Conversion to Regeneration is not felt under these conditions to be difficult. It is the case of those who are regenerate, that is baptised, as infants, confirmed and admitted to Holy Communion, that really troubles us. Must they be converted as well as regenerated? and if so, when does Conversion happen, and how shall we know that it has taken place?

I answer Conversion, or rather the fact which underlies what is commonly called Conversion, is necessary for all the regenerate who live to the age of reason, as necessary as Regeneration is; and when we say that Conversion is necessary for the regenerate, we mean that without it God's gift though given, was despised, and lost.

Let me narrow down our subject, then, to this:—What is Conversion in the case of those who were regenerate *i.e.*, baptised as Infants, and what signs accompany a real Conversion?

Conversion is the conscious act by which man recognises and surrenders himself to the love of God. As faith pre-supposes its object, so Conversion pre-supposes God's grace. And this is true universally, of heathen as well as Christians, of unbaptised as well as of the baptised. Only the Conversion cannot be the same for a Christian and a heathen, because the grace to which they consciously, by the act of Conversion, surrender themselves, is different. Take the case of the Philippian gaoler, Acts xvi. God's grace was working in his heart before he asked "What must I do to be saved?" But the answer was, "Believe on

the Lord, and thou shalt be saved." He believed, and was baptised, and by the "washing of Regeneration," his pardon was assured. In Bible language, he was saved by Baptism after Conversion.

But to those who were regenerate in infancy, the call comes differently. It is still, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ," but there is a reference backwards, as well as forwards. Whatever our life has been since, we cannot obliterate the fact of Baptism, any more than unbelief can destroy the fact of the Incarnation. The fact of our Baptism is there present before us as we stand in the presence of the Eternal. I am "a member of Christ, a child of God, an heir of heaven," and in a moment there rushes in upon us the terrible fact of sin consciously committed and indulged, and in the agony of that knowledge, we are ready to cry, No! that is what I once was. That is what Christ's Incarnation made me. Once I was saved by the washing of Regeneration. Then the barrier of sin was swept away, and the new life of God was poured into my soul. But barrier on barrier has been piled up since, and now, what shall I do to be saved? I am suddenly conscious of a great chasm separating my soul from God. I cannot bridge it over, and the memory of the day when I stood, as it were, with my foot upon the bridge which the love of God in Christ had thrown across the gulf, is misery to me. For half unconscious, half uncaring, I have wandered from it. And around me is the darkness, and before me is the separating gulf, and beyond it, that which I cannot gain, the rest and peace of the Father's home.

It is to a soul in this state that the popular view of Conversion appeals. All the false teaching, which is commonly mixed up with revivalism, will not deter such a soul from catching at the offer of present salvation, and an assurance of peace with God, if it comes from outside itself. Layman or cleric, authorised or unauthorised, matters not, if only he offers that which the soul is longing for, in a voice which is strong and clear. Has the Church of Christ no answer to give in such a case? It may not be a normal case, but it is typical, and of frequent occurrence. It is a real and true instinct of the soul to desire peace with God, a real and true teaching of experience that we cannot save ourselves. Brethren, I speak, as I believe, in a matter on which no formal utterance of the Church has been given, and I believe that if ever there is a case where the ministry of reconciliation is necessary, it is for the soul which cannot be assured of full forgiveness and present salvation. I know that the Church of England does not, except in exceptional cases, and on the death-bed, enjoin confession to a priest, but when I see men in their spiritual pain pouring out the burden of their sins to those who have received no "power and commandment" to absolve, who can but point to that which is already our own,

the written word of God, then I see the wisdom of our Church in appointing and recognising Confession and Absolution. I cannot refuse in life what, if God gives me consciousness and strength, I must claim in the hour of death.

But, whatever be the form in which the answer of Christianity comes to the sin-laden soul, whether it comes through those to whom God has given "power and commandment" to restore the penitent, or whether it comes through the inspired words of Holy Scripture, the answer is the same. There is one Way, and one only, and it is Christ; one Sacrifice, and one only, and it is the death of Christ; one faith, and one only, the faith of Christ; one Baptism, and one only, the baptism into Christ. And however far we may have wandered from baptismal innocence, Christianity knows of no short cuts by which we may return, only the hard and toilsome road of penitence, which the love of God has won for us. We cannot be baptised anew. Regeneration is once and for all. But the life which God gave us in Baptism, the life which sin has poisoned, and earthly desires have choked, may yet, by the mercy of God, spring up in us, and transform us into itself.

The sacramental teaching of the Church of Christ is thus the safeguard alike against theories of human merit on the one hand, and the opposite view which has so taught forgiveness as to open a door to lawlessness. To say "There is nothing to do; Christ has done all" is to turn truth into a terrible falsehood, and under cover of exalting the love of God to make men careless about a holy life. The Church teaches "Christ has done all, that in Him you may do all." He has won for you the grace of penitence that your sorrow and your tears may not be in vain. He who regenerates in Baptism gives pardon to the penitent, that he may live the life of his Regeneration.

The case of the penitent however, common as it is in experience, is not that which Baptism contemplates. For penitence implies that the soul has drifted away from its baptismal state, and by acts of conscious sin has defiled the baptismal robe. Many souls have a different experience. Their spiritual history has been more like that which the baptismal service contemplates, a continual mortifying of all evil and corrupt affections, and a daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living. In them, as St. Augustine says, "The sacrament of Baptism doth precede, and if they hold on in Christian piety the conversion of the heart will follow." It is the great fault of many who preach about Conversion, that they make one case the type of all. But this is to fly in the face of facts. It is to contradict all that we know of the manifoldness of human life and character, and the wonderful working of God's Holy Spirit. "He who struck Saul to the earth, taught Timothy to know the Scriptures from a child." And yet in the quiet saintly lives which seem to us to know

no break, where, at all events, our common notions of Conversion do not readily apply, those lives which from Baptism till the day of Christ seem to have been ever growing in grace, in knowledge, and in love, Conversion, or something which corresponds to it, must have a place. In every holy life there must be a time, known perhaps only to God, and yet a time when regenerating grace given in Holy Baptism becomes a conscious possession. Who shall say when in such a soul the dawn of conscious religion begins? It is as still, as silent, and untraceable, as the dawn of consciousness in the child. I am born by natural birth into a world which is akin to, and yet strangely alien from, myself. It is around me, and about me, and I know it not. Yet a time comes when I begin to realise the isolation of my own personality, to learn

... "the use of 'I' and 'me,'
And find I am not what I see,
And other than the things I touch."

Something, too, as mysterious and as real, takes place when I think of myself as a moral being. As a child I had one thing to learn, one duty to perform, obedience. But a time came, not necessarily after any wandering from the right and the true, when the moral law appealed to me in all the majesty of its own transcendent beauty, and I knew it as the voice of God. Not less mysterious is the transition from unconscious to conscious religion in the lives of those who know no breach in continuity. The little child repeats its lesson at the mother's knee. "God is love." He who has won his way to saintship by the grace of God, pours out the fulness of a life's experience in "God is love." It is no longer an outside truth, a truth to be learned, it is the utterance of his own spiritual being.

Every regenerate soul must make its own the great baptismal gift by a conscious act. We ought to be able to say, I know that I am in the love of God. "I will lay me down in peace and take my rest." But it is the few who can say this, and not recall a time when they began to pass into the state of conscious self-surrender to the love of God. For most of us there was a breach of continuity, an undoing of the past, a return from wandering, a recovery of what is gone. God gave us our birthright, and we have despised and lost it, and when we realise our loss our soul breaks out in a great and bitter cry.

We seem then to be able, at least so far as is necessary, to distinguish between what God does, and what man may be said to do, in the work of salvation. God's grace, *i.e.*, His free love comes first, always first, whether it show itself in the first impulse of the unregenerate towards holiness, or in the mysterious act of regenerating love which cleanses the sinful soul, and brings it back to a true relationship with God. Man's act is conscious submission to God's grace, and obedience

to His will; in the unregenerate the willingness to be led till, like the Ethiopian eunuch, he receive the gift of the new birth; in the baptised, the embracing the life of union which Baptism began, and the sacrament of the altar carries on. And if that union has been destroyed, and the presence of deadly sin bars the entrance of the Divine Life, shall we hesitate to use those means which God has blessed again and again, for bringing back our lost baptismal state, and restoring us to oneness with Himself? God cannot compel the acceptance of His gift. He regenerates, but He does not convert. The gift which comes to us from Christ's Incarnation, through the Divine Society, must be appropriated and made our own by the conscious act of our own free will. This is the truth of Conversion whether it shows itself in a violent breaking away from a sinful life, or in the silent and unnoticed, but not less real, form of a transition to conscious religion.

The greater part of what remains to us of this Term will fall within the limits of Lent. May I, my brothers, suggest to you some great questions by which you may learn your present state before God. He looks at facts, not feelings; we mistake feelings for facts. Ask yourselves, then, prayerfully, and as in God's immediate presence, these four solemn questions:—

- 1.—What did God send me into the world to do?
- 2.—What have I done with my life hitherto?
- 3.—What have I done with the sins I have committed since my Baptism?
- 4.—Have I any right to feel at peace with God?

THE Bishop of Lichfield has appointed the Rev. Percy L. Underhill, at present vicar of Smallthorne, Stoke-on-Trent, to the vicarage of St. George's, Wolverhampton.

THE Earl of Lonsdale has placed in the gift of five Commissioners the incumbency of Ravenstonedale, Westmoreland. The living is vacant owing to the retirement of the Rev. George Atkinson, who has reached the age of ninety-two years.

THE LATE PROVOST OF TRINITY COLLEGE.—In reference to the communicated article on the great and good Dr. Jellet, a very able and competent correspondent writes to us admitting the late Provost's share in drawing up the report of Master Brooke's Committee and vindicating the report in the following words: "I can say with full authority that it was not intended by the Committee to represent the actual reception of the Communion to be unnecessary, where it was possible to have it. But from the Rubric to the Communion of the Sick service, which, of course, is taken from the old Sarum office, and from the Article the Committee drew the inference that our Church did not consider the Body and Blood of Christ to be so incorporated with the consecrated elements as to be *necessarily* given along with them. For in that case 'the wicked, and such as are void of a living faith,' would necessarily receive that Body and Blood, which the Article expressly says they do not."

APPREHENSIVE NERVOUSNESS.
Debility, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Torpid Liver, Kidney Disorders, and every form of weakness may be speedily cured by wearing

HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.

It generates a mild continuous current of Electricity.
Produces no Shock or Discomfort whatever.
Testimonials, Pamphlet, and Advice free, personally or by letter.
Write at once to **Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, MEDICAL BATTERY Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)



FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 10, 1888.

PRACTICAL STATESMEN ON ARMAMENTS.

THE recent remarks of the Prime Minister, the Marquis of Salisbury, in reference to the extreme danger involved by the armaments of Europe, have drawn fresh attention to this subject, in some quarters not always disposed to listen to the representations of the friends of Peace. He said, with emphasis, on that occasion: "In truth, in sad and sober truth, it is impossible that these vast armaments, constantly growing, can continue to watch each other without creating some solicitude, some well-founded solicitude, in those to whom the peace of Europe is a matter of the deepest interest. With these great, heavy, overcharged clouds—charged with the electricity of war, near each other—who is he who shall be bold enough to prophesy that at any given time the thunderclap shall not come?"

Almost simultaneously with the utterance of these words, there was published at Brussels, an interesting pamphlet, in the French language, from the pen of a Belgian ex-Minister of State, M. G. Rolin-Jacquemyns, entitled *Limitation Conventiennelle des Despesas et des Effectives Militaires*, which well deserves attention. He quotes some very interesting statements, almost unknown to the general public hitherto, which a foreign jurist, M. de Martens, has recently extracted from the archives of the Russian Government and published, in French, under the title of "Treaties and Conventions concluded by Russia with Foreign Powers."

These archives reveal the important fact that, as long ago as 1816, the Prince Regent of Eng-

land submitted a proposal to the Governments of Austria and Russia for a mutual reduction of armaments. He suggested that an international Conference of military men should be assembled, with full powers to determine a fixed ratio of troops to be maintained, on a peace footing, by each State. The Russian Government welcomed this proposal, and expressed its desire that such a gathering should be held.

The Austrian Government appears to have felt some hesitation as to accepting the scheme of the British Prince Regent. Nevertheless, it authorised its chief Minister, Prince Metternich, to issue a special memorandum on the question. In that document, this eminent diplomatist remarked that, although permanent armies are indispensable for the support of Governments, yet they are not their only or surest defence. He continued: "The real strength of Princes lies more in their system of government, and in the principles upon which their administration is based; or, in a word, in that which constitutes true moral force, rather than in a great array of military power." And Metternich added these memorable words: "*A very large army presents a considerable danger even for the internal order of the State, because it exhausts those resources indispensable for wise administration.*"

Neither M. Jacquemyns nor M. de Martens gives information respecting the circumstances which led to the indefinite postponement of the disarmament proposal of the Prince Regent. But the little-known fact that such a suggestion was seriously propounded by one who, a few years later, became King of England, and that it was deliberately and to some extent favourably entertained by the two Great Powers to whom it was addressed, furnishes an ample justification for the renewal, in these later times, of some similar suggestion, on the part of statesmen, legislators, and persons of influence.

Such a fact shows that the efforts already put forth in this direction, on more than one occasion, in the British Parliament, by Mr. Henry Richard, were thoroughly in accord with the precedents of practical statesmanship and of the highest diplomacy. The same fact also furnishes an effectual refutation of those cynical and ignorant persons who discourage efforts in behalf of disarmament, by characterising them as of "Utopian or visionary" origin; on the contrary, they have now been shown to have long ago obtained the emphatic approval of the most practised diplomatists.

THE Bishop-designate of Wakefield has appointed the following examining chaplains for his future diocese:—Canon Ingham Brooke, rector of Thornhill, Dewsbury; Canon Whitaker, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; the Rev. Winfrid O. Burrows, student of Christ Church, Oxford; and the Rev. W. Foxley Norris, jun., vicar of Shirburn, Tetsworth.

THE GERALDINES.

"SHANID-ABO."

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.*(Continued from page 94.)*

CHAPTER III.

RUIN OF THE GERALDINES OF DESMOND.

WE come now to speak of the Southern Geraldines in the reign of Elizabeth, and though our digression has been longer than digressions usually are, it was necessary as a sketch of this remarkable sept.

While Shane O'Neill, the head of the Celtic race, was struggling for independence in Ulster, another commotion no less formidable was brewing among the degenerate English of Munster.

The disputes between Ormond and Desmond, originating in pride and lawless ambition, had been embittered since the Reformation began by the fact that while the house of Butler sided with the Crown the Geraldines remained devoted adherents of the Church of Rome. Scarcely had O'Neill's rebellion subsided when the disturbed state of Munster summoned the Lord-deputy to the south. The Geraldines had been always proud and turbulent, but Gerald, the last Earl of Desmond, was weak and vain as well as proud. He gave a curious specimen of his spirit in 1564, when in a battle with the Butlers of Ormond his army was cut to pieces, and he was taken prisoner. As he was being borne wounded off the field, his enemies tauntingly demanded, "Where is now the great Earl of Desmond?" "Where he ought to be," proudly retorted the Baron, "still on the necks of the Butlers."

Sir John Davies points out that the ruin of this family was occasioned by the attempt of Gerald, the last Earl of Desmond, to levy coyne and livery upon the Decies, which Butler resisting, defeated him in battle, and so mortified his vanity that he never ceased to plot against Government, until at last he fell into open rebellion. In 1567 Sydney made a tour through Munster, which he found in great disorder. Throughout Desmond and Thomond—a country of surpassing beauty and great fertility—the scenes presented to the Lord-deputy excited his indignation and horror. The fury of civil war had converted a pleasant land into a waste howling wilderness. Churches lay in ruins; villages, good towns, and castles were heaps of blackened ashes. The bones and skulls of those who had fallen in war or perished by famine were scattered unburied in the fields, and the misery and squalor of the peasantry presented all too faithful a picture of their moral degradation. "For matrimony amongst them is no more regarded in effect than conjunction between unreasonable beasts. Perjury, robbery, and murder counted allowable. Finally, I cannot find that they make any conscience of sin, and doubtless I doubt whether they christen their children or no, for neither find I place where it should be done, nor any person able to instruct them in the rules of a Christian."* The Lord-deputy, when he entered Kilmallock, placed Desmond under arrest—led him as a kind of spectacle to grace his triumphal procession into Connaught, and thence to Dublin. Elizabeth

seems to have considered that Sydney's conduct on this occasion was high-handed and unjust, for she summoned him to court to explain his proceedings. He carried with him Desmond and Sir John of Desmond, the Earl's brother, as hostages for the good conduct of the family during his absence, which lasted from October, 1567, to October, 1568. Desmond was thrown into the Tower, and his imprisonment roused his kinsmen to fresh hostility against the Government. James FitzMaurice rose in the south, and plundered the open country and the villages with merciless ferocity.

But the success of the insurgents was short-lived. The foreign succours on which FitzMaurice relied did not arrive. His adherents melted away, and in the ancient Abbey of Kilmallock, the Geraldine made his submission to Sir John Perrott, President of Munster. "With the eyes of his heart sore weeping and bewailing his most devilish life past," FitzMaurice "acknowledged himself to have most wickedly rebelled against God, and most undutifully against his prince, and most unnaturally against his native country." After such an abject submission we are not surprised that Elizabeth leaned to the side of mercy, and set him at liberty. Meantime Sir Edward Fitton, Lord-president of Connaught, was engaged in suppressing an insurrection of the Mac-an-earlas, two sons of the Earl of Clanrickarde, who had collected their forces and thrown off their allegiance. They attacked Athenry, and burned it to the ground. When urged to spare the church in which his own mother had been buried, one of the fierce youths made reply: "Were she there alive I would burn her, church and all, rather than that an English churl should ever possess the place." In 1573 Desmond and his brother were sent to Dublin as state prisoners, but the Mayor allowed them so much liberty that, under pretence of a hunting expedition, they contrived to escape into their own country. FitzMaurice, too, obtained his release in the same year, and withdrew to the continent, where he sought the aid of France and Spain against the English. He undertook a journey to Rome with the same object, and was fortunate enough to meet in Rome with Saunders and Allen, two ecclesiastics, who aided him to plead the Irish cause so successfully that the Pontiff gave his benediction to the undertaking, and contributed a sum of money towards the equipment of an invading army. He also issued a bull to the prelates, princes, and nobles of Ireland, enjoining them to support the champions of Holy Church, and promising indulgences similar to those granted for services against the Turks. Philip of Spain raised an army of Spanish and Italian troops, and the invaders landed in Kerry, at Smerwick, in July, 1579, where they erected a fort and waited anxiously for that general rising which they had been led to expect would follow their arrival. The Spaniards were not pleased with the reception they met with in Ireland. Desmond was cautious, and shrank from the responsibility of openly joining their standard. FitzMaurice remonstrated angrily with John of Desmond, and even hinted at the likelihood of his betraying the cause. The ferocious Geraldine resolved to show his zeal for the enterprise, and at the same time to commit the house of Desmond so deeply that there would be no possibility of drawing back. Henry Davels, a gentleman of Devonshire, had been for some time resident in Ireland, and was on terms of such cordial friendship with the Geraldines that father and son were the terms with which he and Sir

* Sydney's "Letter on the State of Ireland in 1567."

John of Desmond accosted each other. This man, instructed by the Lord-deputy, visited the Earl of Desmond and his brothers in order to confirm them in their duty to the Queen, and to induce them to join the Deputy in quelling the disturbance. He found them already too far gone in treason to draw back, and he accordingly set out to return to the Lord-deputy. Sir John Desmond followed him to Tralee, where he put up for the night. The house in which he lodged was surrounded in the dead of night by the followers of the Geraldine, who gained an entrance and burst into the chamber of Davels with weapons drawn. Sir John Desmond, with his own hand, stabbed his friend, and his followers butchered his company without mercy.

Thus this desperate chief sealed with the blood of a friend his attachment to the cause of rebellion. Saunders called the savage atrocity "a sweet sacrifice to God."*

The Earl of Desmond inveighed against the perfidy of his brother, and even FitzMaurice could not hide the loathing which he felt for so dastardly an outrage.

But the Papal cause languished in spite of the fiery zeal of Saunders, the Papal Legate, and the glowing assurances of the over-confident FitzMaurice. The Spaniards began too late to see that they had been duped. FitzMaurice undertook an expedition into Tipperary, but the Burkes of Clan William barred his progress, and in a quarrel about some plough horses seized by his followers, three sons of Sir William Burke were slain, and FitzMaurice was mortally wounded. The body of the Geraldine was mutilated and spiked upon the ramparts of Kilmallock.†

After the death of FitzMaurice the command devolved upon Sir John of Desmond, and the Pope sanctioned the appointment, renewing in a fresh bull all the privileges previously accorded by the Holy See. Sir William Drury summoned the nobles of the south to aid the Crown in stifling the insurrection. Desmond came with the rest, but he was at once placed under arrest. No evidence could be produced against him, and he withdrew from the camp mortified and indignant. The two armies met at Monaster-Nena, where the insurgents were hopelessly routed. Allen was amongst the slain, and letters found upon his dead body implicated the Earl of Desmond. The head of the Geraldines was now fairly driven to bay, and finding further evasion useless, he too drew the sword. The clansmen of his race gathered round him with passionate devotion, and a war ensued without a parallel, even in Ireland, for merciless ferocity. Neither side gave quarter, neither side expected to receive it. Desmond fell upon Youghal and sacked it, and became so intoxicated with ambition that he wrote to Sir William Pelham, the lord-justice, inviting him to join the standard of the champions of Holy Church. Soon, however, the tide of fortune turned against him. Carrick-a-foyle was stormed and the garrison butchered. Smerwick shared the same fate, and with a thrill of horror we find the

chivalrous Sir Walter Raleigh presiding over the ghastly massacre of men who had laid down their arms. Connaught caught the flame of insurrection and rushed to arms. Leinster answered the appeal of the South, and took the field. All Ireland was in one blaze of insurrection. Lord Grey swept the southern provinces with fire and sword and halter. The crops were burned in the fields or trampled under foot. The cattle were slaughtered in the stalls. The women and children perished in the flames of their blazing homes, or died miserably of famine amid the bogs and woods. Saunders, hunted like a wild beast from one hiding-place to another, died from want and exposure in the woods of Claonglass. Sir John of Desmond was killed in 1582, and the Geraldine cause was lost. For some little time the devotion of his people, who clung to him in his misfortunes with that fidelity which formed one of the noblest features of the Irish character, enabled Desmond to evade pursuit. He concealed himself among the caverns and recesses of woods and morasses, followed still by his wife and a few trusty retainers, but dogged at every step by the pitiless enemies of his house. One evening a few of his galloglasses drove off some cattle for the support of their chief. They were pursued by the owner, assisted by some soldiers from a neighbouring garrison. They tracked the marauders to a deep glen which opened into a wood, where the soldiers halted, and were just on the point of giving over the search for the night when a light in the distance attracted their attention. Approaching cautiously they found a cabin in which an old man of dignified presence lay languidly before the fire. Kelly, the leader of the party, struck him to rouse him up. "Spare me," he said, "I am the Earl of Desmond." Kelly cut off his head and brought it to Ormond. It was sent to London and spiked upon London Bridge. Desmond was slain November 11, 1583.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

IS THE SECOND COMMANDMENT VIRTUALLY REPEALED?

SIR,—I see the Dean of Durham, in a letter to the *Guardian*, quotes Dr. Arnold, to the effect, that "the fact of the Incarnation is a virtual repeal of the second Commandment." This is a most startling statement, come from whom it may.

1. Grant that figures not worshipped, or intended to be worshipped, are innocuous. So they were, as far as the Cherubim in the Tabernacle, with the Jews.

* Froude gives a different account of the death of Desmond, and one less honourable to the Irish.—"English in Ireland," I., p. 60. Compare Phelan's Policy in loco.

† The territories confiscated after this rebellion amounted to 600,000 acres. Spencer gives a frightful account of the horrors of the famine. "They did eat," he says, "the dead carriages, happy where they could find them; yea, and one another soon after."—"View of the State of Ireland." Holinshed says that the carnage was so awful that one might pass through the land without meeting man, woman, or child, except in the towns and cities. Compare Leland, II., pp. 287-8.

Leland quoting Carew—"Pacata Hibernia"—gives an interesting account of the reception accorded Desmond's son at a later period.

* Compare Phelan, "Policy of the Church of Rome," etc., pp. 209-11; Leland, II., pp. 270-272; King, "Church History of Ireland," II., p. 795; Wright, "History of Ireland," Vol. I., pp. 464-465.

† De Burgh was created Baron of Castle Connell for his services on this occasion. The De Burghs became degenerate soon after 1333. The hereditary use of surnames in Ireland dates from the 10th and 11th centuries. See "Irish Penny Journal," April 17th, May 15th, May 29th, June 12th, June 26th, 1841. Sir Richard Burke of Connaught, the MacWilliam, married the celebrated Grace O'Malley (Granu Weale).

But what if they, in course of time, come to be worshipped? Thus it was in the Romish Church. Thus it may be with us. If Dean Lake or Dr. Arnold said that if images are not worshipped they are harmless, none would object. But it is monstrous to say that "the fact of the Incarnation is a virtual repeal of the whole second commandment." If he had said that the first part of the commandment is not as stringent on us as it was on the Jews, he might have reason. We perhaps need not be as strongly warned against images as the Jews were. But to say that the second part, "Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them"—to say that *this* is repealed by the fact of the Incarnation, is as audacious and anti-scriptural a statement as ever was made. Do the Dean and Dr. Arnold say that we may worship images, because our Lord became a man? What has that fact to do with a positive command of God, a command not repealed in the New Testament?

2. Much nonsense is built on "in the image of God made He man," as if man was made in the image of our Lord, not to be born for thousands of years after. "In the image of God," I am sure, refers not to any shape, for such the Deity had not, but to such matters, as make man like the Deity, and raise him above the brutes. Compare this with what Hebrews i. 3 says of the Son of God, that He was the express image of His "the Father's person." This can only mean, as Pearson says, "identity of nature," p. 201.

3. We in Ireland have a guide for clergy and people, parading the sanction of eleven of our Bishops, by what authority does not appear. With this *imprimatur* on the face of it, it enters every Protestant house and even cabin. This paper ruled first, that a local corporal presence of our Lord's Body in the Eucharist—for there is no other presence conceivable but one of spirit and grace, which it calls heretical. Well, this presence, it says, first is to be adored, as "fairly based" on Scripture, and as "in ninety places at once." Then it falls foul of the Black Rubric, and the 4th and 15th Articles—at least its condemnation is as much against the two Articles as against the Black Rubric. Pearson so understands (p. 244), the 15th Article; the 4th is plain to all. This paper allows writers unreprieved to spurn the Black Rubric as smuggled in at the Savoy Conference, and as of no binding authority whatsoever, it goes on to permit another without *caveat*, to deny that "the Almighty Creator of the universe is bound by the limits which condition a material clod." It must know that the Black Rubric and two Articles put no limits on the Deity, which alone was the Creator of the Universe, but upon our Lord's Body, born 4,000 years after the creation. So this of theirs is all nonsense. But after thus treating with contempt the Black Rubric, it turns round and says that "it virtually enjoins adoration" of a local corporal presence. This is part two in the farce. Part three is that it won't allow anything connected with the subject to be touched on at all, even the difference between "being spiritually present," which it upholds, and "being virtually present," which it anathematizes.

4. Now, what it has done as to adoration of a corporal presence, why may it not do as to adoration of images? It may say, 1st, it is not forbidden; 2nd, it is enjoined; 3rd, the question *finita est*, and cannot be re-opened. This is our position in Ireland. We see this paper thrust into every cabin in Ireland with the sanction of eleven of our bishops. No one, who dares to protest, is allowed a hearing.

Nay, he is abused by editor and all his satellites. False charges are brought against him. He refutes them; but they are not withdrawn, nay, are repeated in various other forms of Billingsgate. What is to be done? We have no Irish organ except the secular press, and a religious paper, coming out only monthly; and, of course, unable to find room for contradiction to all its mis-statements, and, when many of them have had weeks and weeks to do their poisonous work. We depend then on you, sir, and the editors of other such anti-popish papers. But, indeed, the poison comes from your side, and it is doing at least as much mischief with you as with us. *Proximus ardet*. The fire spreads from you to us, and then back again from us to you. We depend on you then to help us to extinguish it, for, if nothing be done, it will consume all that blessed work which our martyrs sealed with their blood.

5. It is well worthy of note what a prominent position in the St. Paul's reredos is occupied by the Blessed Virgin and Infant Saviour. This is Rome's favourite image, because it sets forth the Son under the motherly tutorage of the Virgin. This suits her better than any of our Lord, as a man, even as dying on the cross. And yet, as far as our Lord's own person is concerned, His infancy is the least objectionable time to depict him in, as all infants' countenances must be much alike as to expression. Afterwards, when He is painted as a child, the attempts to unite Divine wisdom with the ignorance of tender years are utterly contemptible. The same may be said of His appearance in the Temple before the doctors. As a man the attempt may be more successful, though I question it. But now we come to the scene of the Crucifixion. How is He to be distinguished from the thieves on either side? Does Isaiah represent Him as the perfection of human beauty? If so, then a model must be sought in a heathen Apollo! But, leaving His body generally, how is His countenance to be depicted? Are painters and statuary, such men generally as would be qualified to conceive of, and depict Deity looking through the features of humanity? An angel might succeed, having witnessed it. I doubt whether a St. Augustine even could imagine it. At any rate, God's reason to Moses, "thou sawest not," is sufficient; and St. Paul speaks of those who "intrude into things which they have not seen." (Col. ii. 18.) I believe that the second commandment, being founded on eternal principles, and on human imperfection, is quite as much binding on us as on the Jews; those persons excepted who can see an image without any tendency to adoring it. When people can gravely say that Moses worshipped the burning bush, it is time to have things finally settled between us and Rome.

AN IRISH PARSON.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION—A PASSAGE OF ARMS BETWEEN DR. LITLEDALE AND THE CATHOLIC PRESS.

SIR,—In this argument, given in the *Catholic Press* of the 3rd inst., it seems to me that the open Romanist fares the best. I will be brief. First, we have Dr. Littledale. "The nature of this opinion," Transubstantiation, "is constantly mistaken, even by professional theologians. It is not a theological doctrine at all. The theological is simply that of the

presence of Christ—we are not here concerned with the mode of that presence—in the Holy Eucharist. Transubstantiation is merely a philosophical theory intended to meet certain intellectual difficulties as to the manner of that presence, and depends entirely upon the notion entertained by the Realist School of Philosophers as to the nature of substance and accidents." It would be more true to say that the theory of transubstantiation was got up in order to make plausible a local corporal, though invisible presence of our Lord's Body. But to proceed with Dr. Litterdale, "and the virtual oblivion into which realism has passed, has resulted in the practical abandonment of transubstantiation (though the name is still retained) by Roman Theologians." This is quite false. The doctrine of transubstantiation is not only asserted in all their catechisms, but is also explained as a change of substance, in the very words of our own 28th Article. But now we come to Dr. Littledale's reason, "For, whereas they formerly taught that only mere phantoms of bread and wine survive after consecration, now the received teaching is that no physical change whatever, of which the senses can take cognisance, is effected by consecration, but that all the accidents of bread and wine remain as they were before." Was there ever such nonsense as this? Before, he says, Rome taught that only the phantoms of bread and wine survive. Well, what do they teach now, according to this wise man? Why, that no change of inner substance takes place, of which our senses can take note; and that all the accidents or phantoms, as he just said, remain as they were before. Six of one, say I, and half-a-dozen of the other. Whether this is a wilful muddle or not, I will not decide. But now we come to his dishonest handling of "the Black Rubric," his trying to cross that *true pons asinorum*. "This," says Dr. Littledale, "is the Anglican doctrine, that 'they' the accidents remain in their very natural substances, expressed in other but equivalent language." How accidents, or appearances, or phantoms, can remain in their very natural substances—they, substance having none—passes my power of comprehension. But I will leave him to the castigation of the Editor of the *Catholic Press*. He merely says "The Anglican doctrine, as contained in the Black Rubric, at the end of the Communion Service, is not that the accidents—Dr. Littledale's 'they' remain in their very natural substance, but that the Sacramental bread and wine remain in their very natural substances." And so the Editor very mercifully passes over this extraordinary specimen of bungling between substance and accidents, and dishonesty as to the plain wording of the Black Rubric.

HONESTY IS THE BEST POLICY.

THE Rev. G. R. Gleig, who has reached his ninety-second year, is reported to be seriously ill. He began life as an officer in the army, but was ordained in 1819. He was perpetual curate of Ash-next-Sandwich 1821-34, rector of Ivychurch, 1822-79, Chaplain-General 1844-75, and Inspector of Military Schools 1846-57. He is the author of a long list of military, theological, and other works.

WE understand that the Bishop of Chichester has conferred the Prebend of Gates in his cathedral, vacant by the death of Canon Lowe, on the Rev. Robert Allen, vicar of Christ Church, Eastbourne. The Bishop has appointed to another vacant prebendal stall the Rev. Perceval Webb, vicar of Portfield. Mr.

Webb has acted for some years as general secretary to the diocesan conference, and as one of the editors of the "Diocesan Kalendar."

THE Rev. Lawford W. T. Dale, vicar of Chiswick, writes to a morning paper, with reference to the reported secession to the Church of Rome of the Rev. A. M. Dale, Curate of St. Mary Magdalene, Chiswick, and certain members of his congregation:—"I must ask you to correct your announcement with regard to the Rev. A. M. Dale, and the congregation of St. Mary Magdalene, except as regards Miss Rawson, whose secession was not altogether unexpected."

ON Friday, the 2nd inst., the Rev. Bartholomew Edwards, rector of Ashill, Norfolk, entered upon his hundredth year. It is probable that he is the oldest living graduate of the University of Cambridge, where he took his B.A., as far back as 1811, the year before Archdeacon Philpott and four years before Lord Eversley. Mr. Edwards does not appear to have held any other preferment than his rectory, to which he presented himself in 1813, the year he was ordained priest by Bishop Bathurst, of Norwich, seventy-five years ago. His health is still good, and he has conducted divine service in his parish church more than once this year.

OUR readers will learn with deep regret that Mr. John Walter Lea, of Plaistow, Kent, died suddenly on Wednesday, the 29th ult., at the age of sixty. Mr. Lea was kneeling in his place at St. Mary's Plaistow, just before the commencement of the Litany, when he suddenly fell down and expired, through failure of the action of the heart. Mr. Lea was an M.A. of Oxford, a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, and of other learned bodies. He was well known as the ablest and best read canonist of the day, and was a man of truly saintly life. His funeral on Tuesday last was attended by a very large number of friends, including Lord Halifax and other official members of the English Church Union, the Guild of St. Alban's (of which Mr. Lea was formerly Provost), and other societies to which he had belonged.

REAL CHRISTIANITY.—Speaking in the Co-operative Hall, Oldham, on Sunday, Herr Cohen said that intolerance among the Romish practitioners, bigotry among the Jewish rabbis, and superstition among the Mohammedan priests had been the cause of more poverty, ignorance, bloodshed, and crime, than all the wars that devastate this portion of the globe. The questions of the day should be, not whether the spiritual teacher was orthodox or not, whether he was a believer in sprinkling or immersion, confession and absolution, or evangelicalism, transubstantiation or the burning of incense, but whether he was a follower of the true Messiah, the great Nazarene, who preached salvation for all souls irrespective of sect or creed. Unless people studied the Bible for themselves, and sought their own salvation, their sins would be transmitted to their children and children's children, and infidelity—the direct outcome of the modern semi-scriptural, semi-material religion called Christianity—would continue to spread. In reference to every new doctrine let them ask—is it upheld, commanded or sanctioned in Christ's teachings? If not, the sooner their voice was raised against it the better for themselves and those who would come after them. What they wanted was, not merely a church of bricks and mortar, decorated with gaudy millinery, and illuminated by scores of burning candles, but a real Church animated by the true spirit of Christ.

THE needs of East London were again brought before an Oxford audience on Sunday night at a meeting in Exeter College Hall, Oxford. The subject announced was "London over the Border," and the special object in view was the support of the Bishop of St. Albans' Fund. The Bishop himself was one of the speakers. The attendance was not as large as at the meeting in support of the Oxford House, which took place a fortnight before; but the audience were very enthusiastic, and the fact that it is possible to bring together two great gatherings of undergraduates in the space of a fortnight to listen to speeches on such a subject is very significant, and emphasised a remark made by the Warden of Keble in his speech on this occasion—that in his own undergraduate days such a meeting would have been impossible.

THE DEFENCE OF THE CHURCH IN WALES.—A meeting was held on the 13th ultimo, in Mr. E. W. Evans' rooms, St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, with a view to forming a Society for furthering the interests of the Established Church in Wales. There were present about twenty Undergraduates connected with the Principality, and on the motion of Mr. C. J. Davies (Queen's), seconded by Mr. Evans (St. Edmund Hall), the chair was taken by Mr. J. R. Roberts (Merton). In his opening speech, the President pointed out the urgent necessity for all those interested in the Church in Wales to do their utmost for its advantage. He then went on to show some of the claims the Church had upon the Principality, and concluded by laying before the meeting the scheme on which it was proposed that the Society should work. Mr. Davies then addressed the meeting and called attention more particularly to the unity of the Church of Wales with the Church of England. During his concluding remarks the very Rev. the Dean of St. Asaph entered the room, and was greeted with loud applause. In a short, but highly practical speech, the Dean expressed his sympathy with the movement, and pointed out the many ways in which the several Welshmen there present could advance the claim of the Endowed Church in Wales, and concluded by urging on all true Welshmen the necessity of being active in its defence. A vote of thanks to the Dean was then proposed by Mr. Evans, and seconded by Mr. G. Heaton (Worcester). The meeting afterwards discussed the best way of carrying on the Society. The following were elected members of the Working Committee:—Messrs. J. R. Roberts (Merton) President, C. J. Davies (Queen's) Treasurer, E. W. Evans (St. Edmund Hall) Secretary, W. L. Wynne (Jesus), O. R. Hughes (Exeter), G. Heaton (Worcester), and W. Williams (Non-Coll). The Committee invite all who are interested in the Welsh Church to become members of the Society. The Society held a most successful meeting on Tuesday, February 21st, in Mr. Heaton's rooms, at Worcester. Mr. Griffith-Boscawen (Queen's) read a paper on the Tithe Agitation, and a discussion followed.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro*, of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Allen, Rev. Robert. M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Eastbourne; Prebendary of Gates in Chichester Cathedral.
 Anstey, Rev. A. C. C., Vicar of St. John's Bedminster; Vicar of St. John's, Redland, Bristol.
 Bailey, Rev. George, B.D., Rector of Addelthorpe, Lincolnshire.
 Beal, Rev. Samuel, Rector of Norton Davie, otherwise Green's Norton, Northamptonshire.
 Bond, Rev. S., Second Master of St. Saviour's Grammar School, Southwark; Principal of the Church Educational Institution, Bolton.
 Brooke, Rev. Canon Ingham, Rector of Thornhill, Dewsbury; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop-Designate of Wakefield.
 Browne, Rev. Henry, B.A., late Curate-in-Charge of Ingoldsby, Lincolnshire; Vicar of Creetingham, Suffolk.
 Burrows, Rev. Winfrid O., Student of Christ Church, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop-designate of Wakefield.
 Chettoe, Rev. E. E., B.A., Senior Curate of Holy Trinity with St. Andrew's, Gravesend; Wilberforce Missioner.
 Clougher, Rev. Lewis, Curate of Neath; Rector of Goytre, Monmouthshire.
 Cox, Rev. W. Wetton, Clerical Secretary London Association in Aid of the Moravian Missions.
 Edmondson, Ven. Charles Gresford, M.A., Trinity College, Oxford, Archdeacon of St. David's; Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter.
 Fisher, Rev. Charles Timbrell, B.A., Vicar of Over Kellet, Carnforth.
 Hammond, Rev. F. J., A.K.C., Curate of Bromborough, Cheshire; Curate-in-Charge of St. Cyprian's, Brockley, and Chaplain of Lewisham Cemetery.
 Hatch, Rev. Henry John, M.A., Vicar of Little Linford, Bucks.
 Hickes, Rev. T. H. F., M.A., Chaplain of St. Michael's Home, Cheddar; Rector of Draycott, Wilts.
 Mattinson, Rev. G. F., Curate-in-Charge of St. Peter's Mission Church, Knowl.
 Moss, Rev. A. R., Senior Curate of St. George's, Birmingham; Vicar of St. John's, Ladywood, Birmingham.
 Norris, Rev. W. Foxley, jun., Vicar of Shirburn, Tetsworth; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop-designate of Wakefield.
 Sandford, Rev. Polliott G., M.A., Curate of Ecclesall; Vicar of St. Maurice, York.
 Skrine, Rev. J. H., Assistant-Master at Uppingham; Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond, N.B.
 Tudor, Rev. Prebendary H., Rector of Wolborough, Newton; Rector of Lustleigh, Devonshire.
 Underhill, Rev. Percy Lees, M.A., Vicar of Smallthorne; Vicar of St. George's Wolverhampton.
 Webb, Rev. Perceval, Vicar of Portfield; Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral.
 Whitaker, Rev. Canon, Chancellor of Truro Cathedral; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop-designate of Wakefield.
 Young, Rev. P., Curate of All Saints', Stamford; Vicar of Langtoft, near Bourn, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- De Lisle, Rev. George Walter, at the Priory, Ipplepen, near Newton Abbot, on the 4th inst., aged 61.
 De Veau, Rev. Walter, M.A., Chaplain to the Hahemann Connalescent Home, formerly Vicar of St. Stephen's, Tovil, Maidstone, and of St. Peter's, Stonegate, Ticehurst, at Hilfield, Bournemouth, on the 1st., aged 65.
 Graves, Rev. John, M.A., Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty, at Kensington Palace, on the 4th inst., aged 63.
 Le Breton, Very Rev. William Corbet, Dean of Jersey, and Rector of St. Helier's, Jersey, in London, on the 28th ult., aged 73.
 Niven, Rev. William, B.D., formerly Incumbent of St. Saviour's, Chelsea, on the 29th ult., aged 78.
 Osborn, Rev. Arthur, E. D., at Haynes Vicarage, on the 2nd inst., aged 38.
 Sutton, Rev. Frederick Heathcote, Rector of Brant Broughton, Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral, at Brant Broughton, on the 2nd inst., aged 55.
 Yardley, Rev. John, for more than fifty-one year's Vicar of St. Chad's, Shrewsbury, at Claremont House, Shrewsbury, on the 2nd inst., aged 82.



The Church of England Pulpit.

PREPARATION FOR ETERNITY.

BY THE REV. CHARLES RICHARD PANTER,
M.A., LL.D., MEMBER OF THE SENATE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

SERMON PREACHED IN SWIFT'S ALLEY CHURCH,
ARCHDIOCESE OF DUBLIN.

"Therefore this will I do unto thee, O Israel; and because I will do this unto thee, Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel."—AMOS iv. 12.

THIS solemn, minatory message was delivered by the prophet Amos to a people who had become notorious for oppression, gross idolatry and profanity, and for perverse wilfulness in immorality. They were confirmed in their vicious course by the example of one of the most brilliant and adventurous, but iniquitous kings that ever swayed the sceptre of Israel, the namesake and nature-twin, too, of that monarch of unhallowed memory, "Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin."

During the long, eventful reign of King Jeroboam the Second, God sent Israel unstinted temporal prosperity. Their armies, shielded and bannered by the unchanging faithfulness of Jehovah, had, in accordance with prediction, recovered the fertile lost portion of their inheritance, and restored the frontiers of Israel from Hamath the Great even to the Dead Sea. Their land was glutted with plenty. Its pastures teemed with flocks and herds; the yield of their fig orchards was liberal and luscious; their groves of olive trees flourished, bearing precious and profitable fruit; and the purple blood of their vines filled their wine-vats to overflowing. But although God for His covenant and compassion's sake befriended their temporal interests, they spurned His covenant, disdained His compassion, and wearied out the patience of their long-suffering Father. At length, God dealt with this people as He had dealt with nations before their epoch, and as He has dealt with empires since their day. He put a period to their national prosperity, and turning from them the light of His countenance, sealed up the fountain of His benevolence, and left them to abide the fury of His righteous indignation. That adversary of adversaries, internecine strife, was in their midst, spending the strength of their population, and sparing neither prince nor peasant. Home discord invited alien interference, and invasion followed, ending in foreign conquest. The sword of the

Vol. XXV.—No. 638.

fierce Assyrian was unsheathed against this God-abandoned land, and bathed red in the blood of its doomed inhabitants. Like locusts the heathen host swarmed, and bared the soil of its prolific crops. Beleaguering the mightiest cities, the warriors of Asshur breached their walls, and entering, wrecked them and looted them of their treasures. In the wake of war's desolation, famine and drought stalked through the land in gaunt companionship; blasting and mildew smote its verdure, and the lean remains of its gardens and vineyards, fig trees and olive trees, were devoured by the palmerworm; while to culminate these manifold afflictions, pestilence came upon Israel "after the manner of Egypt," and so near were they as a nation to extinction that, in the strong language of the prophet Amos, they were but "as a fire-brand plucked out of the burning." And the impassioned, mournful refrain of the prophet follows—"Yet Israel returned not to the Lord their God."

Let the severity of God to a highly favoured, but rebellious nation seven hundred and eighty-seven years B.C., be a heeded warning to any equally favoured but recusant nations in eighteen hundred and eighty-seven A.D. Infatuated Israel presumed to wrestle against God, and by the ill-dared match decreed their own inevitable fall. How soon was to be enacted the supreme tableau in that rebellious nation's history! How soon were total rejection from the Covenant, banishment from the beloved land of promise, and complete effacement from among the commonwealths of the earth, to subscribe *Finis* to the historic scroll of the Ten Tribes of Israel! What wonder the zealous prophet should cry in bitter irony in the insensate ears of this people, amid the twilight of their impending doom—"Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel!" And yet might we not imagine the Tekoan seer as feeling intuitively while sorrowing for the ruin of his lost country—

But oh! what dark, ill-omened cloud
Doth my prophetic vision shroud,
That louring o'er my land's estate,
Doth break in tears to weep her fate?

Nationally to all nations, and individually to all men, these words, "Prepare to meet thy God," are a warning as greatly needed to-day as they were of yore to the doomed Ten Tribes of Israel, who were about to forfeit for ever their citizenship among the nations as the penalty of treason against Jehovah. Profitable words these, if we use them as the text for daily soliloquy, and put the sermonised soliloquy into practice in our daily lives.

Oh! how great we are in small things, and how small we are in great things. This fact is well illustrated by the foolish care men take to prepare for the relatively trifling affairs of time-life, and the careless folly with which they neglect preparation for the great eternal life of which time-life is but the embryo. How few of us need any sharper

spur than mere momentary interest to urge us to pursue with alacrity the ordinary engagements of life. With what monomaniac concentrativeness do men steer on with the pet projects with which their hearts are freighted. With what overmastering power of will, in the embarrassed lists of life, do men brush obstructions aside and smite difficulties down, that they may reach swiftest the goal of their heart's desire :—some, hastening to be rich, or grasping to obtain power, that they may enjoy purchased pride, and buy honours, too often at the expense of honour, and always with the tollage of care superadded :—some, hastening to acquire much learning, or aflame to display the lustre of innate genius, that they may be lauded and hero-worshipped by their fellow men :—others, meaner-aimed, hastening to be notorious, that they may be the subject of every-day talk, and flutter like the giddy moths of an hour in ephemeral fame. On they all go, never weening that Time is marking off a line, perhaps midway in their career, perhaps just ere they touch the fancied goal of their ambition—a line which they must pass, but which they cannot pass, except divested of all the trappings, and denuded of all the little interests of mortal life. And at what point soever in a man's career Time marks off that line, there, at that point, the meeting with God must take place. There, at that point, must be surrendered, and that too within the span of a moment, all the life-profits of ambition ; whether they be the accumulations of wealth in the full garner of the rich man's plenty ; or the careful gleanings of poverty's patient thrift ; or the hoarded heaps of sordid avarice ;—whether they be the possession of hard-won power, and authority as tenaciously held ; or learning diligently laboured for and with difficulty acquired ; or the bright gifts committed to creative genius that dazzled admiring multitudes ;—all there must be surrendered, there at the meeting point of Time and Eternity, for there, temporal wealth, temporal power, temporal learning and genius, all things temporal must be forsaken—forsaken as native to earth and not to be acclimatised in the Paradise of God. The Paradise of God ! Oh, the wealth loved and laid up there is that which cannot be wrought for, is a gift freely offered to all men, even the exceeding riches of the grace of God in Christ Jesus : the honours applauded by the hosts of heaven are those won by the army of victorious saints that follow their triumphant Lord, and make the welkin ring with praises to His holy Name : verily the learning prized there a child may understand, and little children all must become who would receive it, namely, the knowledge of God unto salvation.

Look abroad upon nature, God's beautiful picture-book, by means of which we His children are indulgently taught how He shapes visible means, by invisible power, to visible ends wise and great. Turn over the leaves of that picture-book, and see

how every state of existence is also a stage of existence, and each stage a preparation for a developed and maturer one. For instance, the vapour is a preparation for the cloud ; the cloud for the shower ; the shower for the stream, and the stream contributes its current to fill the basin of the mighty deep. Again, the seed is the preparation for the shoot ; the bud for the bloom ; the flower for the fruit. Look on what page of the great picture-book you will, from evolvment to completion the stages of preparation are ever advancing to the fulfilment of being. In the highest type of physical existence with which we are acquainted—human kind—infancy, youth, prime, and old age, are each in turn the preparation for the others ; and, would to God ! that one and all they were made preparation stages of grace for glory, as they are preparation stages of nature for physical decay. Would to God they were stages of growth in grace during time for eternity !—eternity, when and where God from the beginning has appointed that every soul of man, prepared or unprepared, shall meet Him. Are we reckless of preparing because we deem the meeting for us *cannot* take place to-morrow ; *shall* not take place to-morrow month ; *may* not take place to-morrow twelvemonth ? My brethren, before the unborn morrow shall flush to birth in the cradle of the eastern skies, thousands of our fellow-creatures shall lie pallid and cold 'neath the dusky shadow of the pall of death, whilst their souls, prepared or unprepared, shall have met their God. And Christ Jesus grant of those thousands, the many and not the few may be the chosen !

I once witnessed a melancholy example of a soul's unpreparedness to meet God. This experience is recited not to pain, but to profit you, my brethren. I accompanied a friend of mine, a professional man, whose duty it was to attend the bedside of a titled, wealthy, bad man, who lay a-dying. The dying man was one who had lived solely for the gratification of sinful appetites, and for the debasing pleasures of the world, the flesh, and the devil. He was one who was termed by men of the world a thorough man of the world. He was one who had lived centred and circled in self, and he admitted in his last hours that he had never thought of sacrificing a pleasure, nor even of denying himself a momentary whim, for either the good of his neighbour or the glory of his God. In brief, he was bound over, enslaved, and sold under sin. Some time before his end, death by severe sickness warned him that the door of this world was about to be shut behind him for ever. The premonitory pangs of a fatal disease speedily drove him to consult many physicians. They, on examination, informed their titled patient that the cure of his malady was beyond the reach of human skill ; and one of their number advised him to set his affairs in order, and *prepare* to meet his God. "Ah !" said he, filled with the devil's courage,

bravado—"I do not care; my instinct of life is strong, and I do not believe you that I shall die. What are you good for, if you cannot cure me?" "Cure you!" exclaimed his physician, "not all the doctors in Europe could work that miracle." Soon afterwards his evil courage deserted him, and a distracting uncertainty of life occupied its place. A few weeks' agony cured him of bravado, for the devil's courage is but counterfeit pluck. In his changed humour of mind he sent for his lawyer, to make his last dispositions. Most uncertain now of life, he determined to make certain that his affairs after his death should go by legal will according to his living will. Yet he declared that he feared his will might be broken, and broken it was. When all hope of life was bereft him, but not until then, he sent for a clergyman to prepare him for exit from this world, and to fit him for appearance in the next,—to prepare his soul to meet its God. Just before unconsciousness sealed up his faculties of reason, he thought to procure at the hands of a fellow-creature that saving grace, that Divine imputed righteousness which during his whole lifetime he had scorned to seek and secure at the hands of a merciful Saviour. What did he wish to do? Horrible it is to say it, he wished to mock God. In the certainty that his earthly career was nearly run, he concluded to patch up a treaty of reconciliation, if possible, with his Maker. He seemed to be under the dreadful delusion that God needed him, and not he God. He seemed to have the notion that the minister of religion, the declarer of absolution to "all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel," could, by some occult process, communicate imputed righteousness, and wash a guilty soul white by human merit. Having spent his tale of years in trespasses and in sins, he offered God, through another man, at the verge of time, his sin-polluted soul as an acceptable sacrifice; and as a thankoffering for all the good things of this world with which he had been so plenteously endowed, he presented his Almighty Benefactor with a prematurely worn-out, loathsome carcass. But oh! his delusion turned to despair when he was told by the faithful clergyman, that it was beyond the power of any human being to make a proxy peace with God for another.

Never shall I forget the beautiful, bright autumnal day on which he consented to receive the clergyman, with the beams of God's light of nature shining full on the golden corn fields, and kindling in splendour upon the centre of the landscape, the stately habitation of the dying nobleman, in whose dark, desolate heart, alas and alas! the brighter beams of God's grace were eclipsed for ever. Amidst the yellow grain in the adjacent field, I heard the light-hearted mower whistling merrily as he whetted his scythe, in accompaniment to the lively clink of the rasp rubbing the steel; and I thought how gladly the expiring nobleman would

be willing to exchange his riches, his titles, and his honours, to possess the short lease of life remaining to that poverty-stricken but mirthful labourer. Ay, a hundred thousand earthly coronets he would have laid down then, for the least of the crowns of glory that fade not away. And I thought too, had the living man not left to the dying man the duty of preparing to meet God, the nobleman would not begrudge the humble labourer, life, health, and lightheartedness; but would smile in the joy of a rejoicing which no man taketh away, even in the joy of exchanging the transient glee of earth for the ever-abiding jubilees of heaven.

I record no more of this unhappy experience. Enough for my purpose as a preacher of the Gospel of truth has been unfolded, enough to show that a bad life brings a bitter, bitter death. Why have I related this lamentable case of an individual, in connection with the calamity of Israel rejected? Because they are parallel lessons illustrating God's dealing with persons and peoples who reject the terms of His covenant of mercy, and who make not the day of God's giving the acceptable day of their receiving. The minister of the Gospel exhorting a wicked person at his last hour to prepare to meet his Maker, stands the sad antetype of the prophet Amos exhorting a doomed lost nation to prepare to meet an offended God. Through the inspired words of Amos, the voice of God appeals to us individually, and re-appeals with double emphasis through the fact of souls rejected, who have rejected saving grace. For God uses our experiences to make His Word clear to us.

Though the bitter words of Amos dropped the gall of righteous irony upon the hearts of the froward and wicked, yet the compassion of God taught his lips to distil the balm of spiritual consolation upon the hearts of all them that seek the Lord. "Seek the Lord," he says, "and ye shall live." "Hate the evil and love the good." "Seek good and not evil that ye may live, and so the Lord of Hosts shall be with you." These words read like New Testament words. Like pearls of great price such promises of mercy as these gleam brightly here and there upon the dark fringe of the Tekoan's prophecy.

May the Divine Elias, the Holy Spirit of God, in the soul of each hearer prepare the way of the Lord, and make His path straight;—prepare each heart to receive, and put on the Lord Jesus in all simplicity and godly sincerity: for in the language of Amos, "All the nations shall be sifted as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain (individual) fall upon the earth,"—not one soul prepared to meet God, not one soul in Christ, shall be lost.

THE advowson and next presentation of the rectory of Coombe Hay, near Bath, is stated to have been sold to the Rev. J. G. Bingley, of Snodland, Rochester, for £850.

"GIVE US THIS DAY OUR DAILY BREAD."

A PAPER BY REV. F. TILNEY BASSETT, M.A.,
PREBENDARY OF WELLS AND VICAR OF
DULVERTON.

"Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον."—ST. MATT. vi. 11.

"Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν."—ST. LUKE xi. 3.

IN the prayer which our Lord gave His disciples as a form or directory which His people should use in all ages of the Church, there is one petition, and one only, that comprises a reference to our temporal necessities. I say comprises, because it is well known that in the early Church it was held and taught that "the bread which endureth to everlasting life" was not only comprehended in this petition, but was more urgently sought for than "the bread which perisheth;" and an early version, the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome, emphasised this opinion by changing *quotidianum*, the previous rendering of ἐπιούσιον in the old Latin texts, into *supersubstantialem* in the Gospel of St. Matthew, though probably from fear of giving offence he retained the accustomed word in the Gospel of St. Luke. In an exposition of this passage this twofold application of the term "bread" should not present any difficulty. Our Lord's utterances frequently combine figure and fact, the outward sign and the thing signified, the natural and the spiritual, so that we may well believe that He bound up in one petition the cravings of our bodily and ghostly appetites. It is not, however, with this that we are concerned, but rather with the strange fact that in this important petition the most important word familiar to us as "daily" is surrounded with a mist of difficulties. The word itself stands in utter solitude, being nowhere else found either in classical or Hellenistic usage, except, of course, in patristic quotations of these places in the Gospels. Its derivation is disputed, and its meaning in consequence is uncertain. It may be derived from *lévai*, and so refer to the future in *time*, or from *éivai* (οὐσία), and refer to the supply of our *wants*. Commentators have dealt with the question, and generally give the reader the alternative choice, and treatises have been written on the subject of much interest and value; among the latter nothing perhaps has appeared more exhaustive and painstaking than the appendix of a work entitled, "For a Fresh Revision of the New Testament," by the present Bishop of Durham. But notwithstanding the research that has been made, and the arguments that have been produced, it can hardly be said that the question is finally settled; perhaps that end can never be attained. The present paper is an endeavour to gain a step in that direction.

Our Lord's teaching is often traceable for the first germs of thought to the Old Testament Scriptures. This evolution is sometimes patent and direct, and sometimes latent and partial. Lines of thought and particular expressions disclose the connection, and when the continuity is discovered the interpretation of any such passage is much facilitated. There are four phrases in the Old Testament which it has been thought may throw light on our inquiry. When the Lord rained down manna upon His people in the wilderness, and gave them bread from heaven to eat, it was said, "They shall gather a certain rate every day," literally *the matter of a day in his day*,

דָּבַר יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ (Ex. xvi. 4). We read in Numb. iv. 7, of the *continual bread*, לֶחֶם הַתָּמִיד, and in the same verse we learn that this was identical with the *shew-bread*, לֶחֶם פָּנִים (see Ex. xxv. 30, and for the making and ordering of the same, Lev. xxiv. 5). Lastly, we have in Prov. xxx. 8, the phrase, לֶחֶם הָקִי, *the bread of my statute or appointment or allowance*. The first of these passages brings before us the supply of the manna, which is specifically called the *gift* of God (see Ex. xvi. 15, and John vi. 31, etc.), and the expression, the "matter of a day in his day," might well suggest either "give us to-day," or "daily bread." The "continual bread" will exhibit the ordinance as one of perpetual obligation, and the "shew-bread," the *bread of faces or face*, denotes the bread of manifestation, that is, the manifestation of God. Thus the revealing angel or agent of the Father, the angel of Jehovah, מַלְאָכִי, is entitled by Isaiah lxiii. 9, מַלְאָכִי פָנָי, *angel (or agent) of His presence or face*. In Ex. xxxiii. 13, the same Divine Person is simply styled *My presence or face*, פָּנָי, and we are doubtless to understand the first commandment in the Decalogue with the same reference, "Thou shalt have none other gods in addition to My presence or face," אֵל פָּנָי. The shew-bread will therefore set forth God's presence revealed among His people, the gift of Himself to them, a type satisfied in Him who was the "bread of God that came down from heaven," the "Bread of Life" that giveth life unto the world. The last phrase, "Bread of my statute" or "of my appointment," that is, that which Thou allottest to me, has a more mundane complexion; this sense of the allotted portion is sustained by ch. xxxi. 15, where it is connected again with טָרָף. Hence the prayer will mean, "Feed me with the bread that both in quantity and quality Thou seest to be sufficient for my provision and sustenance." Reference has been made to all these passages that the reader may have them before his mind, and attribute to them, or withhold from them, any influence they may have been supposed to exercise on the question either collectively or separatively.

We have already seen that the word under consideration, ἐπιούσιος, is only found in these two parallel passages in the first and third Gospels, and that its derivation, and by consequence its meaning, are both uncertain. The first step in our endeavour to arrive at a decision will be to investigate how the word was represented in early translations of the Gospels. The Syriac testimony claims the first place in evidence, as it was in that language our Lord conversed with His disciples, and revealed the great lessons of His mission. The Syriac Gospels are of the highest value in this point of view, because they must either retain the very words which the Divine teacher uttered, or else, if translated back again from a Greek copy, would recall the original words, or give a rendering which, we cannot doubt, at that early age, while the language was a spoken one, would be known to be a proper equivalent. But here a difficulty meets us at the outset. There are two very ancient Syriac texts, the one known as the *Peshito*, which may be called the authorised Syriac version, and the fragments of the Gospels known as the *Curetonian*, so called after the name of their learned editor. Much controversy has gathered round these documents as to the priority and purity of their respective texts. No one can read

these two authorities side by side without seeing, I think, that they come from separate sources, and that one could not be an edition of the other. Among the many differences that distinguish these versions our word is one. In the former it is represented by **נֶחֱמָה**, of our necessity, and in the latter by **מִסְכֵּן**, generally rendered *continual*; the later Syriac versions follow the *Peshito*. In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, St. Jerome tells us in his Comm. in Matt. vi. 11: "Instead of *supersubstantial* bread I found **מָחָר**, that is to say, of the *morrow*, making the sense, 'Our bread of the morrow,' that is, of the future, 'give us to-day.'" (See Nicholson's "Gospel according to the Hebrews," p. 44.) This strange rendering seems to be preserved in the Memphitic version, and the Thebaic gives also a future sense. The old Latin versions appear to have translated the word by *quotidianum*, *daily*, but as we have stated above, in St. Matthew's Gospel St. Jerome in his revision changed this into *supersubstantialem*. It will thus be seen that the *Peshito* and later Syriac and St. Jerome favoured the derivation from *ὄσθια*, *subsistence*, and the Curetonian Syriac, the Hebrew Gospel, the two Egyptian versions and the old Latin the derivation from *ἐβαι*; the one class regarding the *need of food*, and the other the *time of its supply*. Can we trace with any probability the sources of this difference? The original word which fell from the lips of the Lord we cannot decide, but it would seem that the compilers of the two Syriac versions, probably finding a difficulty in the word, traced its supposed connection to two distinct sources; what are they? As we find the adverb **מִסְכֵּן** in Numb. iv. 7 in the Syriac as a translation of the Hebrew **תָּמִיד**, "the *continual* bread," it has been thought that there is good ground for supposing that the Curetonian translator derived his rendering, **מִסְכֵּן** from that source, and identified the bread which we ask for *continually* with that bread which was *continually* set before the presence of God. (See Lev. xxiv. 8.) Can we trace with any probability the origin of the *Peshito* interpretation? Perhaps only approximately. Still, I think we can approximately. In Prov. xxx. 8, as we have seen, there is a prayer that has direct reference to our temporal wants; the petitioner asks for neither poverty nor riches, and adds, **הַתְּרִפְנִי לֶחֶם חֲקִי**, *feed me with food convenient for me*, literally *bread of my statute*, or of my appointment, *i.e.*, the bread which thou hast appointed for me. The LXX. rendered this **לֶחֶם חֲקִי** by τὰ δέοντα καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπων, *the things necessary and the things sufficient*. Aquila, in his translation, gives ἄπρον ἀκρεβασμῶν μου, *bread of my strict observance*; Symmachus, διατροφὴν ἰκανὴν, *sufficient maintenance*; and the Latin Vulgate, *victui meo necessaria*. The *Peshito* Syriac renders it by **בֵּיתִי**, *habitation of my sufficiency*, *i.e.*, sufficient shelter. When we compare the language of the Lord's prayer with that of the prayer in the Proverbs, it is true that we do not find the same word used, but the meaning is so near, and the sense in which the passage in Proverbs was understood by the various translators so entirely corresponds, that we may well suppose that our Lord, who made many tacit references to the Book of Proverbs, had this prayer in His mind. At all events the similarity in meaning forms a link between the two prayers, and

will probably account for the interpretation given to *ἐπιούσιος* in the *Peshito* version of the Gospels.

We now turn our attention to the word itself. *Ἐπιούσιος* is an adjective derived either from *ἐπί* and *ἐβαι*, and has a future sense, or from *ἐπί* and *ἐβαν* (*ὄσθια*), and signifies *for subsistence* or *livelihood*. We have seen that translators in ancient days were divided on this subject. Let us examine the claims of each derivation. For the first the authority of the Curetonian Syriac is specially pleaded; it is indeed the sheet anchor of this interpretation. It is claimed for this document that it is more ancient and reliable than the *Peshito* as we now have it. The old Latin is urged on this side, though the interpretation is different; all that can be said is that it seems to refer to *time* more than to *need*, and the other early Oriental versions are derived mainly from the Syriac, and seem to favour the Curetonian tradition. But the crowning argument which was advanced by Canini and Grotius and recently has been enforced with great learning by the Bishop of Durham, is that the first *iota* in the word must be elided if the second derivation is maintained—the word must be *ἐπουσιος*, and not *ἐπιούσιος*. The Bishop shows by several examples that where *ἐπί* in composition retains the *iota* before a vowel, the word with which it is compounded had originally the *digamma*, and therefore elision could not take place. It must, therefore, be derived from *ἐπιέβαι*, the *iota* belonging to the verb and not to the preposition. *Ἡ ἐπιούσα* is constantly used for the *morrow*, or it may be for the *coming day* viewed from an early hour in the morning, and so our word will be an adjective formed from this phrase, and the prayer will mean, "Give us this day our bread of the morrow," or "or the coming day."

These arguments are strong, and demand the most respectful consideration. With regard to the first argument, it has been the fashion of late with some of the most learned critics at home and abroad, to assume a re-casting of the Greek text of the New Testament in the fourth century. They throw aside or undervalue the traditional text of Antioch, and set up that of Alexandria as supreme. The documentary evidence, however, of the former line has a concomitant history, and the latter has none. Its authority is based only upon a theory derived from internal and comparative evidence. If such a revision took place, it must have been mentioned by some of the writers of that period, among whom were some of the greatest lights of the Church; and even if it were granted that such a revision did take place, the noted scholars of that day, who had before them all the testimony to be advanced for both, elected that text which finds so small favour in our times.

But the *Peshito* Syriac belongs to this family, and so to account for this perplexing agreement the theorists proceed to assert that a contemporaneous revision took place also in the Syriac text. Of this, again, there is not an atom of historical evidence, and it is likely, we may ask, that two distinct branches of the Church, influenced hitherto by independent traditions, would not only revise the text in unison, but leave out passages, and alter most important words without much debate and disagreement? Could such a revolution occur in days of controversy and mutual jealousies, and no trace of the struggle be recorded for after ages? Such a proceeding is in itself morally impossible, and the contemporaneous silence is inexplicable. The revision of the Latin text has transmitted its record of strife, why have no

the Greek and the Syriac? Moreover, we have no proof that the Peshito gives a text posterior to the Curetonian. The two texts, as we have observed, are independent witnesses. The Peshito could not be derived from, or be a revision of, the Curetonian. Words and phrases embodying the same teaching are quite different, and there could be no purpose in wilfully changing the one for the other. They occupy the same position relatively to each other that the *textus receptus* of the Gospels does to the manuscript of Beza. Further, it has been all but conclusively shown by Mr. Gwilliam, in his essay in the Oxford "*Studia Biblica*," that the Peshito text is the earlier one. No reliance can therefore be placed on the supposed superiority of the Curetonian fragments. To the Latin testimony we shall refer hereafter.

But by far the most important feature in this inquiry is the presence of the *iota*. We may grant at once the force of the argument that words beginning with the *digamma* would retain, and words not so beginning would elide, the preceding vowel in ancient and classical Greek; but this rule may be considered capable of modification if we remember that this word *ἐπιούσιος* was coined for this very place. It is a word without a preceding history. Who were the inventors of it? Were they learned grammarians? Could they be esteemed as philologists? St. Matthew, in whose Gospel the word originated, was a Jew and a tax-gatherer, and his companions, who with him used the prayer, were Galilean fishermen. What would they know about the *digamma*? Little is really known about it now, what should they have known about it then? What so natural that illiterate men familiar with Syriac as their vernacular tongue, and having some acquaintance with Greek from their admixture with the Gentiles round them, should compose a word in the simplest form they could frame to embody the meaning they desired to convey? *Ὀύσια* appears in the Gospel of St. Luke xv. 12, 13, in the sense of *subsistence*, though it may be observed that in both Syriac versions it is represented by a different word altogether from those under discussion here, but it will serve to show that the word was known and so used in Apostolic times.

But, on the other hand, let us suppose that the word which our Lord employed was quite lost to memory, and that the Greek one only survived, then it will follow that the framers of a Syriac version would do their best to represent *ἐπιούσιος* in their language. They must have known what sense was attributed to the word traditionally among Christians, and the Peshito rendering has, as we have seen, quite as good, if not a better claim than its rival, and we hold it to be most improbable that the Curetonian reading should be changed in both Gospels into that which now stands in the Peshito.

But here a question of a totally different nature is suggested. What is the meaning of *ܐܡܝܢ*, the Curetonian equivalent of *ἐπιούσιος*? Let us remember that the utmost that can be asserted is that it means *continual, in constant succession*. There is nothing about "to-morrow" or "the coming day," as such apart from the general idea of futurity. We may pass over the difficulty of praying for to-morrow's food on the previous day, and confine ourselves to the lesser difficulty of interpreting the word as referring to the day on which the petitioner has entered. The request for food for the coming day could only be made in an early morning prayer, but in the Gospels the

form is prefaced by *ὅταν*, *whenever* thou prayest, St. Matthew vi. 6, and *whenever* ye pray, Luke xi. 2, which seems to forbid such a limitation. We are led on thus to examine whether there exists a real and substantial difference between the words found in the Peshito and the Curetonian in their respective meanings. It is true that the adjective found in the other passages, where we meet with it in the New Testament, bears the sense of *continual* and *constant* (see Rom. xii. 12; Phil. i. 3; 1 Tim. v. 23 and Acts xii. 5; 1 Tim. v. 5); but this meaning is mostly associated with *perseverance*, and both rest on the fundamental meaning of *trustworthy* and *reliable*. If we compare the Hebrew root we shall find that *אמן* signifies to *make fast*, or *strong*, to *build*, to *maintain*, *foster*, and *bring up*, and in the passive to be *supported* and *made firm*, and hence to be *true* and *trustworthy*. And the cognate adjective signifies *sure*, *true*, and *firm*. The Syriac verb, from which our adjective is derived, means to *persevere* and be *constant*, and in *Aphel* to *trust* and *believe*, and thus it will appear that the primary sense of our word is *certainly*, and that *continuance* is a secondary and derived meaning. The Curetonian rendering, therefore, may imply nothing more than, "Give us to-day bread on which we may rely." Thus the idea of *time*, as such, will vanish, and that of *certainly* of a supply of our wants take its place. Thus interpreted, the two witnesses will be found not to be at great variance with each other, and the Curetonian adjective will fail to supply a foundation for the superstructure that has been reared upon it. It may be, indeed, that from this double meaning of the Syriac word the confusion originally arose.

Another class of facts now calls for consideration. How was *ἐπιούσιος* understood by the Greek Fathers? Origen mentions both derivations, but prefers that from *οὐσία*, and interprets it mystically of spiritual food. It has been advanced that Origen invented this derivation from *οὐσία*, and that it obtained favour afterwards through his great authority, but the Peshito rendering existed long before Origen. Moreover, Origen's mystical interpretation severs him from the writers of the line of Antioch, who interpret the word concerning our bodily wants. Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and other Greek writers favour the same derivation. The chief point to be observed here is this, that it cannot be supposed that men of such attainments as these Fathers were, who were well versed in Greek as their vernacular tongue, and some of whom lived in the city which was so famed for its Greek grammarians, could have derived a word in an illegitimate manner. If the composition of the word from *ἐπί* and *οὐσία* had been so flagrantly wrong and untenable, they must have known it, and would not have built up their teaching on a patent error. The adjective *ἐπιούσιος* appears to have been brought into use, perhaps coined, by the LXX, though the cognate noun was in classical use; and *ἐτερούσιος*, *δμοούσιος*, *δμοιούσιος*, and *συνούσιος* (the corresponding noun of the last-named was in use, but in a different sense), were invented and introduced by the Church. These are all clearly derived from *οὐσία*; why should not the Evangelists, who chronologically stood midway between the two, have also introduced a like compound of *ἐπί* and *οὐσία*?

This may be the fitting place to suggest, as subsidiary to our argument, some probable references in the New Testament. St. Paul seems to have in mind a kindred line of thought to this petition, and, if so, to sup-

port the meaning we are advocating, when in 1 Tim. vi. 8 he speaks of εὐσέβεια μετὰ αὐτάρκειας, and connects this αὐτάρκεια, *sufficiency* or *contentment*, with διατροφὴς καὶ σκεπάσματα. And some further light may be gained from the high authority of St. James ii. 15, 16, where he interprets τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς by τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος. The reference is unmistakeable to the Lord's prayer. There is some ground for believing that St. James wrote this Epistle in Syriac, and in the Peshito version of this Epistle the last phrase is identical with the word in the Lord's prayer, the difference being only one of gender. The Latin renderings are of secondary importance. There may be some difficulty in accounting for the old Latin *quotidianum*. At the best it must be a loose rendering. If the translator had understood ἐπιούσιος, as St. Jerome tells us the Hebrew Gospel did, as referring to the "morrow," why did he not render it by *panem crastinum*, or if as referring to the "coming day," why not by *hodiernum*? *Quotidianum* is "daily" in the sense of as often as one day succeeds another, and if this simple continuance were only intended, why did not *futurum* serve his purpose? perhaps he only meant what was wanted for each day. *Quotidianum* is certainly not a strictly literal translation of ἐπιούσιος, or of either of the Syriac words. With regard to *supersubstantialem*, which St. Jerome introduced in St. Matthew's Gospel, perhaps it has not been borne in mind that his intercourse with his first teacher in Hebrew, a Jewish convert, may have influenced him in this interpretation as well as the opinion of Origen and others on the subject. It savours of an Oriental mode of thought, and may be compared with the "true bread," a meaning which borders close upon the Curetonian epithet, and the spiritual signification of the manna given "day by day" might contribute to this interpretation. As an exact translation it has but small claims.

It is worthy of notice that modern scholars of the highest rank have found no difficulty in deriving our word from *οὐσία*, though some have called attention to the objection presented by the *digamma*. Among these may be reckoned such names as Olshausen, Tholuck, Stier, Godet, Wordsworth, Alford, etc. Delitzsch, in his note on Prov. xxx. 8, maintains this derivation, and in his Hebrew New Testament renders *ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον* of the Evangelists by לֶחֶם הַיּוֹמָה, *bread of our allowance*, evidently connecting it with the prayer of Agur. The translators of the Prayer-book of the English Church into Hebrew for the use of Jewish Christians present the same rendering. Strange to say, Dr. Lightfoot, the author of the "Horæ Hebraicæ," adopts the derivation from *lévai*, but quotes a passage from the Talmud, which evidently favours the other view: "The necessities of thy people Israel are many, and their knowledge small, so that they know not how to disclose their necessities, let it be thy good pleasure to give to every man כְּדִי פֶרֶקְתָּו *what sufficeth for food*," etc. (See Gandell's edition Vol. ii. p. 151.)

Lastly, is not internal evidence against the derivation from *lévai*, and in favour of that from *οὐσία*? Whatever may be said to the contrary, is it not clear that the morrow is to take care of the things of itself, and can we believe that the petition should be read, "Give us this day the bread of the morrow"? Or, as has been said above, could we restrict this prayer to early morning use only, "Give us this day bread for the coming day"? Or, if we could bring our minds

to admit such a limitation, would it not be a tautology in so brief a sentence to have "this day," and "for the coming day," thus crowded together? Again, "daily bread" can only mean the bread given us each day, and is not the same tautology evident?

But derive the word from *οὐσία*, and all falls into order and good sense. *Give us this day bread for our being or support, supply our necessities*. The internal evidence counterbalances the external difficulties, which have been magnified. Before such an interpretation the question of a digamma on the lips of Galilean peasants surely vanishes.

THE Vintners' Company has given a donation of ten guineas to the Curates' Augmentation Fund.

THE Bishop of Rochester writes as follows on the subject of organ recitals and other musical performances in parish churches:—"An incumbent in the diocese has claimed my direction on a question which has lately stirred some brisk and not unimportant discussion—that of the legality of using parish churches for musical entertainments, with payment charged for admission. The suitableness of raising money by such a method is a distinct matter. It may be of service to others, as well as to him, that I should publish an opinion here, communicated by the Chancellor of the diocese:—"The question of the legality of demanding a money payment for admission to a service or other function held in a church has not, I believe, been thoroughly discussed in a contested case. But it seems to me that such a demand violates the right of parishioners to attend the services of their parish church without payment, subject, as to certain parts of certain churches, to a liability to pew-rents, defined by statute. I cannot conceive that it is possible to use a church for public purposes which do not transgress the 88th Canon and are yet independent of this right of the parishioners. I think that the function in question must either itself be illegal, as an act of desecration, or the parishioners have a right to be present without payment.' Hitherto, whenever notice has been sent to me, of course with corroborative evidence, that a musical entertainment is contemplated in a church, to which admission is charged by a money payment, I have distinctly forbidden it; and for any inconvenience or disappointment caused thereby those who violate the law must be held chargeable, not he who protects it. Moreover, I wish it to be clearly understood that, under similar circumstances, I shall do the same again. The House of God must not be lightly degraded into a concert-room, merely because it may be found a convenient place for making money. But there is a way out of the difficulty which neither violates the rights of the parishioners nor disturbs the associations of the devout. Let some collect, with a brief address, be said at the beginning; then let the music, of course of a sacred character, follow; the Benediction will conclude the service, after the taking of an offertory for whatever object is desired, either at the doors or from seat to seat. By this arrangement, which is now constantly carried out, and so far as I know generally sanctioned, no injury is done to anybody; and I for one should be sorry for the person to whom the opportunity of listening to sacred music devoutly performed by a competent choir in church is not not only a joy but a help."

Certain HARNESS Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
RHEUMATISM
 Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh,
 writes:—"The Electropathic Belt has completely
 cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense
 agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."
 Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of
 Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the
 Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of
 Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on**
application to Mr. C. H. Harness, Consulting
Electrician, the Medical Battery Co., Ltd.
Only Address, LONDON, W.
52, OXFORD ST. (Corner of Rathbone Place.)
 Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1888.

"I AM THE LIVING BREAD WHICH
CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN."

THE meaning of these words has been well ventilated in our columns by able writers on both sides. Before closing the question we think it well to say a few words ourselves. Our Lord speaks of the bread which is to give life to the world. If He speaks with an eye to the Eucharist, afterwards instituted, we must remember that He said of the bread and wine that the bread was His Body, dead, slain, and broken, and that the wine was His blood shed from His veins. A dead Christ then He called the bread. As no dead Christ existed then, the bread could not be turned into it. As no dead Christ now exists, neither can it now take the place of the bread. As the words, "this is My Body," cannot be taken literally, we must resort to St. Paul's, "is not the bread the communication of His Body?" But as we cannot understand that the bread conveys to us a dead body not existing, nor a glorified living body, of which our Lord spake not, we are left to the conclusion that the bread represents or is endued with, and conveys to us, all those graces from our Lord's Body which our infirmities require. Why should we despise these, as if they come not up to the idea of His Body? Cannot the Holy Ghost supply to us from that Body more than tongue of man can describe, or mind of man conceive? And does not our Lord say plainly, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing"? Having disposed of the words of institution, and St. Paul's paraphrase, we now come to those texts which seem difficult, and which have been made use of in order to prove contrary to 4th and 15th

Articles, and Black Rubric, as well as to common sense, that our Lord's Body may be corporally in more places than one at once. First, we have our Lord saying to His disciples, "the Son of Man which is in heaven." Of course, if our Lord said plainly that His Body, though on earth, was at the same time locally in heaven, it would be a different matter. But His words require no such meaning. He was God, as well as man, and He at times speaks of His Divine nature alone. Thus He says: "Before Abraham was, I am." Here He speaks of His Eternal Deity. In the same manner He says: "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" As Deity He was in heaven before He came on earth. That, as God, He should be omnipresent whilst His Body is confined to one place, arises from the fact that it is really a body like ours; that after the Resurrection it was a body like ours, our Lord made His Disciples certify themselves by their touch. Those who deny our senses the capacity of distinguishing bread from flesh, deny to the Apostles' senses the capacity of ascertaining that the body they saw was a real body at all. If our eyes are no guides, how were their eyes guides as to the identity of the body they saw with the body with which they had lived before His death? When they saw Him eat and drink, could their eyes be relied on? Could their ears testify that His voice was that of their former Lord? If transubstantiation be true, our eyes are no guides; even to be able to assure us that we read the words "This is My Body," really in the New Testament our senses are made useless. If a man steals, how can it be seen that what he takes may not be really his own, so that he is no thief. And this is not the only commandment which he might violate, under pretence that his senses are no certain guide. And why are all laws human and divine to be made little of? Because we are to be bound by the literal words "This is My Body," whereas I have shown that, as He speaks of His Body dead, not now existing, they cannot possibly be taken literally. But Romanists and their imitators, while they profess to take the words literally, do not do so; because they say they mean "body, blood, soul, and divinity." A literal following then is given up. Soul and divinity cannot be learnt from the simple words "this is My Body, slain, given and broken, and blood separated from my veins." If there is a difficulty in comprehending how one nature is omnipresent, while the other is limited to one place at a time, we must remember that the same difficulty attends others of our Lord's attributes. As God His knowledge was infinite. His Father's love for Him was infinite; yet we read that as man He increased in wisdom and favour with God. For man to pronounce upon what becomes God is almost presumptuous. But certainly it is highly so to pretend to understand and decide

upon the very contrary attributes of a being who was, and is, at the same time, infinite as Deity, and as a man bound by such limits as confine the bodies of one of His creatures. When we have shown that the risen Body was such as ours, our Romanisers fly off to the change caused by His ascension, because the Apostles could not testify as to that. (See Pearson, p. 391.) But such persons must give up the 4th Article, as well as the Black Rubric, because it tells us that He took to Heaven, and will return with, a body like ours in all things appertaining to the perfection of our nature. We do not think it necessary to refer to what has been sufficiently shown from Pearson, that our Lord's human nature was of the substance simply of the Virgin, His mother, and not derived to her from Heaven, or any other source.

PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY.

REMARKABLE as have been the results recorded by the directors of this Company in past years, the thirty-ninth annual report of the Board discloses a condition of progress and success greatly in advance of that of previous years. In its ordinary branch of business it has issued 37,450 new policies in the past year against 25,567, assuring £3,903,635 against £2,715,429 in the year 1886. With regard to the industrial business, which is a trustworthy gauge and indicator of the intelligence, temperance and thrift of the masses, we have again to record that the figures contained in the report are considerably in advance of any previous returns. The premiums actually received reached the total of £3,058,501 being an increase of £147,206 over that of the previous twelve months. There were 142,665 deaths amongst the policy-holders during the year, and the company divided £1,204,823 amongst their families. The number of policies in force at the end of the year was 7,599,554, no less than one-fifth of the whole of the population of the United Kingdom being insured with the Company. We concur in what Mr. A. H. Bailey, the actuary said, viz., that "The success of the Prudential is due to the wonderful organisation which has been built up by time, thought and patience, by the manner in which it has adapted itself to the wants of the community, and by the scrupulous fidelity and promptitude with which all its engagements have been met." The *Prudential* has become a most beneficent institution and a powerful instrument in abating the intemperance, improvidence, and consequent dependence and poverty of the working classes.

ERRATUM.—In the last number, on p. 119, in the 30th line of the first column, the word "inner" should have been printed "outer."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

REGENERATION AND CONVERSION.

SIR,—I have read with interest Mr. Aubrey Moore's sermon, in which he endeavours to make plain to the Oxford undergraduates the relation in which conversion stands to regeneration in the Christian life. In these days of sensational teaching the subject is an important one, as on one side lies the danger of seeking and relying upon instantaneous salvation, and on the other of lowering the Gospel of the grace of God. What Mr. Moore says is so good, from a practical point of view, that I feel no desire to criticise it; what I take up the pen for is to ask for information as to one portion of the subject, where I fail to get hold of his precise meaning.

Where I am at a loss is where he answers his own question, "What is regeneration, or the new birth?" Just before asking it, he calls regeneration an "ecclesiastical term." Now in the hands of a divine who knows his terminology, *ecclesiastical* is antithetical to *theological*, and connotes what pertains to the visible Church and our relations to it; while *theological* has reference to God, and the spiritual relations in which our souls stand to Him. If then regeneration be an *ecclesiastical* term, the thing meant by it would seem to be a change of relation to the visible Church, an entrance into it and commencement of a new life within it—not an inward or spiritual change in our own being or higher nature. But when we come to the definition of regeneration, just the opposite seems to be asserted. "Regeneration is the restoration of man's common nature. . . . The regeneration of collective manhood was the work of the Incarnation. . . . Humanity, which had fallen, was by that act taken into God, and the Sacrament of Baptism ingrafts the individual man into the perfect humanity of Christ." Now whatever these phrases mean, they are at least all theological, not ecclesiastical ones. What they express is not a change of relation to the visible Church, but a change in the very nature of the individual man.

My first question, therefore, is this: Which view of regeneration does the sermon take, the ecclesiastical or the ontological?

My second relates to the definition, "Regeneration is the restoration of man's common nature." I wish to ask what this means. The Tridentine doctrine is that man, after his creation, was invested with a special gift of supernatural righteousness, which super-added gift, having been lost through the Fall, is restored by Baptism. Is this what the definition means? About this supposed special gift the Anglican formularies are silent. What they teach is that every man has inherited a fault and corruption of his nature, etc. A "restoration of man's common nature" would seem, then, to mean a getting rid of the inherited taint, and regaining the untainted nature which came from the Creator's hand. But unfortunately for this sense, the Anglican Article expressly says that "the infection of nature doth remain in the regenerate." What then is the restoration of the common nature which takes place in regeneration?

My third question relates to the distinction made in the sermon between what is effected by the Incarnation, and what is further done by Baptism. "Col-

lective manhood" is said to have been regenerated by being, in the Incarnation, "taken into God." It would seem from this that human nature is already regenerated in the lump, and that every human being born into the world since the Incarnation is born regenerate. Yet surely our formularies say the exact contrary. But if the meaning be that the regeneration of collective humanity by the Incarnation is only potential, not actual, then baptism must become the instrument, not of declaring and sealing to the individual recipient his redemption and *status* as a child of God, but of actually transforming him by "healing in him the wound of human nature, taking him into God, and grafting him into the perfect humanity of Christ." This would make regeneration a profound ontological change, effected by the baptismal rite. On the other hand, we are taught to trace the change further back, and say, "That is what Christ's Incarnation made me." What I wish to know is how Baptism and the Incarnation are meant to be related in the work of regeneration; and whether the sermon, by speaking of "the life which God gave us in Baptism," means to draw between the baptised and the unbaptised the distinction which Professor Drummond draws between the regenerate and the unregenerate, namely, that the former have a spiritual nature, the latter not.

Once more, in quoting from the Catechism, I observe the words "heir of heaven" substituted for "inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." May I ask if these are meant to be equivalent phrases? The former seems to point to the future in hope, the latter is generally interpreted as signifying an actual possession in this life of a part in God's kingdom of grace on earth. PRESBYTER.

SIR,—I am not quite sure if Canon Moore's views of conversion will find general acceptance amongst your readers. I do not think they ought, for they are scarcely satisfactory. I refer to these views as expressed in his sermon reported in this week's PULPIT. The texts of the sermon were Rom. viii. 1 and 2 Cor. v. 17. I do not see what these texts have to do with the subject, but on this point, I will only remark, sermons are much too frequently not expositions of Scripture.

I read through the sermon with the hope of obtaining from it a clear exposition of the Canon's views of the subject. I was disappointed. If, with the Scotchman, I ask, What has he proven? I am obliged to answer—Nothing. To say the least the Canon as yet does not understand the word as it is understood by those who use it. With them it is a name for a real, tangible, and by no means imaginary thing.

I will not follow the Canon through his sermon. Such a course would obviously occupy more space than could be given. If I have traversed his teaching, it will be quite easy for any of your readers to show where I am wrong.

I do not think, though I am speaking just now from memory, that the Scriptures anywhere use the word in its modern sense. I may say the same, I imagine, of the Articles and Formularies of our Church. I am open to conviction if I am wrong. The principal terms we use are, justification and sanctification. The former describes that act by which the religious life is begun. The latter, that (rather those) by which it is developed. These are our terms, and they are intelligible.

We have kindred terms, as, for instance, regeneration and renewal. These, I take it, cross the others, and express *kindred* ideas.

Other churches—I know I shall be reproached for speaking thus—have their peculiar terms. The Independents, I believe, use the expression, "being decided," and mean by it, "making a real and definite stand for religion."

I do not think it is far from the truth to say that the term "conversion" is a word distinctly characteristic of the Wesleyan body. With them it describes pretty much what we understand by justification. It is really a more objective expression. It amounts practically to the same thing.

It would be of course impossible to say particularly and accurately what object Canon Moore had in his sermon, but, if he wished to take up a word which covers a real idea, and make it apply to an imaginary one, he has, no doubt to his own satisfaction, succeeded admirably.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, Thrapston,
March 10th, 1888.

EMPHASIS.

SIR,—A few weeks back your reviewer, writing in the PULPIT, referred to the way in which he recommended the Nicene Creed to be read. As he is not alone in his opinion, I would like to call attention again to the matter. I do this because I think the opinion has no solid foundation.

He thought that in reading this Creed we ought to say "*God of God*." We should lay very great stress indeed upon the preposition. He gave as his reason the fact that the "of" was a translation of the word *ek*. Now why this is a valid reason, or can be a valid reason, I fail to see entirely. If "of" translates *ek*, well and good. If it do not, another word must be chosen. No amount of hammering will make one word mean another. But there ought to be no difficulty—and there is none—in understanding that "of" here means "proceeding." To conceive another meaning is to be irreverent.

Two words on this question of emphasis. (1) Words must be distinguished into picturing and colouring words. Prepositions are sometimes colouring words. In such a case they must be so treated.

(2) The proper way to give the relative importance to words is not hammering, falsely called emphasis, but making the word to cover the idea. More on these points another time.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, Thrapston,
March 10th, 1888.

THE BREAD WHICH CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN.

SIR,—In Gordon's "Palestine," published by his direction after his departure for Nubia, page 101, there is:—"As God the Son was incarnated, or dwelt in a temple of flesh, so the Holy Ghost dwells in a temple of flesh in believers—the Church or Body of Christ. . . . There can be no question that the word 'incarnation' (not a Scriptural one) is as applicable to the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in believers, as it is with respect to God the Son having taken flesh."

"This may be a mere fanciful view, but it is not an absurd impossibility. Neither is there anything absurd in the idea, that the Body of our Lord Christ descended from Heaven, in something more than a merely figurative sense. Your correspondent "Inquirens" seems to attribute to me opinions which he only infers. I certainly do not subscribe to the contents of his extract from Smalcus, which I have seen somewhere already.

The canon of interpretation referred to by Mr. Bassett is well known, and is useful, but is also susceptible of misuse. An undiscerning application of it might lead to either of the opposite errors, confounding the Persons and dividing the substances.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

March 8th, 1888.

THE LATE PROVOST—THE BLOT IN THE REVISION REPORT.

SIR,—I have read the note on my communicated article. I did not say that the design of this Committee was to represent the reception of the Communion as unnecessary. I am sure they did not wish to say any such thing. The Communion might be received as before, with administrator and bread. But the grace is represented as coming immediately from God in heaven, and not with the bread, from the officiator's hands. This is why faith is made the sole means by which the grace passes from God to the soul. Grace, coming from God with the bread, does not prove that the ungodly benefit by it, no more than by sermons, etc. When an obex is interposed, grace profits not. Rome teaches that persons can profit by partaking of sacraments, who are not in what she calls a state of grace. It seems that it was against this notion that the 29th Article was directed. The Rubric in office for Communion of sick can only mean what that in Sarum Missal means, viz., that God is not bound by the laws He lays on us. Whether we may say that grace is incorporated with the elements or not, the Catechism says that they are "ordained by Christ Himself as a means" of conveying the grace. This the Report of the Revision Committee expressly denies. Faith is the sole means, according to it. It and the definition in the Catechism are irreconcilable. At p. 9, we read, "*the mean*" (not, be it observed, *a mean*), "*whereby is faith.*" Again, at p. 11, we read, "The doctrine of the objective presence would still involve the necessity of an oral reception of Christ's Body by worthy communicants." In a word, the necessity of faith as a condition of reception would be conceded; but its necessity as *THE mean* of reception would be denied. But our Church has completely negatived this supposition by the declaration in her Article, already referred to, namely, that "the mean, whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith." If the Rubric in office for Communion of sick can prove that our Church accounts priest and bread unnecessary, equal force has the Rubric in Sarum Missal to prove it of the Church of Rome. Both Rubrics prove the same, and only as much in each case.

WRITER OF COMMUNICATED ARTICLE.

P.S. At page 32, we are told that bread is all that the Officiator gives. The Body of Christ, on the contrary, "is given by the hands of the great High Priest Himself," p. 33, as if this could not be done through or by bread and mortal officiator.

Reviews and Notices.

"HAND AND HEART." Published monthly, at 7, Paternoster Square. Price 1d. Edited by Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D.

THIS cheap monthly periodical is nicely illustrated, and contains much useful and interesting information, together with evangelical teaching, and we hope it will have a wide circulation; our readers might do well to take it in for their servants and households in general.

"THE FIRESIDE." Pictorial Magazine, monthly. Price 6d.

THIS is now published in a new and enlarged form, and is also edited by the Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D. Its aim is to provide useful reading, and it is written in a decidedly Christian tone. Good serial stories appear in it to suit lovers of pure fiction, and there are articles to interest most readers, whatever their age or taste may be. All the publications edited by the Rev. Charles Bullock should be highly valued for their evangelical religious teaching.

"HOME WORDS." Monthly, price 1d.

THIS is another valuable periodical published by the same office, and conducted by the Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D. Our readers will find this paper most useful for distribution and circulation amongst the artisan class of our population, railway porters, etc., their wives, etc., etc. Many of these could spare 1d. a month, and might be pleased to have so much interesting reading for such a small sum.

"THE DAY OF DAYS." Monthly, 1d.

THIS Paper, published at the same office as those above, and also conducted by the Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D., seems more especially designed for Sunday reading. It contains much that is interesting and instructive, and also tales illustrating Bible truths. We can strongly recommend all these periodicals, and trust they may be circulated largely, as pure literature is of priceless value to the nation at large, and when joined with simple Gospel teaching, as in this case, it is impossible to tell how far its beneficial influence may extend.

"SONGS OF CHEER FOR HOURS OF PAIN." By the Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D.

THIS little pamphlet is especially designed for use in sickness. It contains four hymns printed on tinted paper, and we hope the thoughts suggested may prove a comfort to many who are suffering from weary hours of pain and sickness.

"STORIES ON THE COLLECTS." By C. A. Jones and the Rev. S. G. Lines. Vol. I., Advent to Easter. London: J. S. Virtue & Co., pp. 383. 1888.

WE have before us a most interesting collection of stories on the collects for each Sunday from Advent to Easter. We suppose that Mr. Jones and Mr. Lines intend in another volume to carry them to the end of the ecclesiastical year. If the second series prove as good as the first we think the authors will

be well repaid for the completion of the task they have set themselves. Each of the stories is full of interest to young people, and conveys a good and easily understood lesson. Their chief merit is that they are all suited to boys and girls of every class. They will be found most useful by those who teach in Sunday schools or instruct their own young people at home. The stories are also well worth being read by grown people. We have to thank Mr. Jones and Mr. Lines for a valuable addition to our literature for the young.

LAST Sunday night there was a capital meeting in the Divinity Schools, Cambridge, in connection with the Cambridge mission to Delhi. The Master of Trinity occupied the chair, and opened the proceedings with some hearty words of encouragement, and the Rev. S. S. Allnutt, who has returned for a brief visit to England, gave a most interesting account of the work in which the little band of Mission clergy have been engaged.

THE *Durham Advertiser* states that the Bishop, Dean, and Chapter have invited the Pan-Anglican Conference to visit their cathedral. According to present arrangements there will be a celebration on Tuesday, the 31st of July, at eight; morning service, with sermon by one of the American prelates, at 11.30, and the festival of the three northern cathedral choirs (York, Ripon, and Durham) at four. At 6.30 a banquet will be given by the Bishop and Dean and Chapter to the distinguished visitors in the hall of the castle. On the following day, by the invitation of the Bishop, the visitors will attend a service in the chapel of Auckland Castle, on the occasion of its reopening after the restoration which is now being carried out, and will afterwards lunch with his lordship.

TESTIMONIAL TO THE REV. A. JORDAN, M.A.—On Tuesday, March 6th, at Victoria, the Rev. Albert Jordan, M.A., late senior curate of Ebbw Vale, who has recently been appointed to the charge of St. John's, Gowerton, near Swansea, was presented with an address, beautifully illuminated by Messrs. Waterlow, of London, and a purse of (£40) Gold. C. B. Holland, Esq., J.P., presided, and was supported by Dr. Vachell and the leading inhabitants of the district. We were pleased to notice such a gathering of the working class, as we think it is a good sign that, where suitable clergymen can be found, Welshmen are as much Churchmen as Nonconformists, and thus the failure in the past has been the want of such men as Mr. Jordan, and not from any inherent distrust in the Church itself. Mr. Holland and other gentlemen addressed the meeting, and the Rev. A. Jordan responded in a feeling manner. A vote of thanks to the chairman closed the proceedings, which are worthy of record, as showing the strength of the Church in a district which is supposed to consist mainly of dissenters.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atkinson, Rev. Charles, Rector of St. Mary's, Manchester; Rector of Etherley, Durham.
Bickerstaff, Rev. C. J., Vicar of Monyash, Bakewell; Vicar of Dronfield, Derbyshire.
Biscoe, Rev. Edward, Curate of St. Stephen's, Gurnsey; Rector of Marholm, Peterborough.
Burder, Rev. A. H. F., Vicar of St. Paul's, New Swindon; Vicar of St. John's, Bedminster, Bristol.

Churton, Rev. Matthew, A.K.C., Rector of Smeeton, West-
by, Leicestershire.
Collison, Rev. George Vaux, B.A., Vicar of Clodock and Perpetual Curate of Longtown, Herefordshire.
Cooke, Rev. Edward Alexander, B.A., Curate of Tamworth; Vicar of Attleborough, Warwickshire.
Cremer, Rev. F. D., Vicar of Upholland, near Wigan; Rector of Keighley, Yorkshire.
Danks, Rev. Benjamin, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Bishops-hill Senior, York; Vicar of Tettenhall Wood, Staffordshire.
Gace, Rev. Frederick Arthur Jeudwine, Chaplain to the *Ganges*.
Gandy, Rev. Richard Norris, M.A., Rector of St. Margaret's, Canterbury.
Hamilton, Rev. C. W., B.A., Curate of the Parish Church, Bingley; Rector of Broughton, Skipton-in-Craven.
Hickes, Rev. T. H. F., Vicar of Draycot, Somerset.
Holden, Rev. H. B. M. M., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Bow-
ling; Vicar of Caunton, Newark.
Hunt, Rev. J. B., Curate-in-Charge of Navestock, Essex.
Lambert, Rev. John Jeffrey, Vicar of Longnore with Leebot-
wood; Rector of Norbury, Staffordshire.
Laycock, Rev. G. T., formerly Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society in the Diocese of Rochester, Newcastle, and Durham; Rector of Terwick, near Petersfield.
Nevin, Rev. David, Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Raleigh*.
Patterson, Rev. Robert, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Selhurst, near Croydon.
Phelps, Rev. Philip E., M.A., Incumbent of St. Jude's English Church, Glasgow.
Roberts, Rev. A. C., Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist, Epping; Vicar of Great Dunmow.
Roberts, Rev. H., B.A., Vicar of East Lulworth, Dorset.
Ryan, Rev. Alfred T., Curate-in-Charge of Ferry Fryston, near Pontefract; Vicar of Adlingfleet, near Goole.
Sowter, Rev. G. A., Local Association Secretary of the Colonial and Continental Church Society; Chaplain of the Missions to Seamen, Port of Bristol.
Wattsford, Rev. H. J., Vicar of Lavenheath, Suffolk; Vicar of Bishopston, Durham.
Wills, Rev. George F., Curate of St. James's, Wigan; Vicar of Upholland, Wigan.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Atkinson, Ven. Archdeacon P. R., at 21, Grosvenor Street, on the 5th inst.
Dawson, Rev. George, formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, for forty-seven years Rector of Woodleigh, at Woodleigh Rectory, South Devon, on the 7th inst., aged 84.
Hanbury, Rev. Arthur, for sixty years Vicar of the parish, at Bures Vicarage, Suffolk, on the 7th inst., aged 86.
Hulbert, Rev. Charles Augustus, M.A., Vicar of Almondbury, Huddersfield, and Honorary Canon of Ripon, on the 5th inst., aged 82.
Jackson, Rev. John, Vicar of the parish, at Countesthorpe Glebe, near Rugby, on the 25th ult., aged 62.
Kemp, Rev. Henry William, M.A., Canon of York. Master of the Charterhouse, Hull, and thirty-three years Vicar of St. John's Church, Hull, at the Charterhouse, Hull, on the 7th inst., aged 67.
Levien, Rev. John, M.A., Rector, at Burnham Thorp Rectory, Norfolk, on the 4th inst., aged 68.
Longland, Rev. G. L., at Hadlow Down Vicarage, on the 3rd inst., aged 73.
Massey, Rev. Thomas, B.A., for forty-eight years Vicar of Hatcliffe and Incumbent of East and West Ravendale, and formerly Vicar-Choral of the Southwell Collegiate Church, at the Rectory, Hatcliffe, Lincolnshire, on the 4th inst., aged 78.
Moore, Rev. William Clark, M.A., Oxon, Vicar, at Holy Trinity Vicarage, Tulse Hill, on the 10th inst., aged 61.
Rofe, Rev. Alfred Augustus, Vicar of Wingates, near Bolton, Lancashire, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 10th inst.
Solari, Rev. Angelo Antonio Nicolo Francesco, at Ocker Hill Vicarage, on the 8th inst., aged 61.
Tipper, Rev. John Gore, M.A., Cantab, Chaplain of Her Majesty's Convict Prison, Dover, at 13, Harold Terrace, Dover, on the 5th inst., aged 57.
Whittington, Rev. Henry Fothergill, M.A., Priest, for some years Vicar of St. Cyprian's, Durban, at Durban, Natal, S. Africa, after a long illness, on the 13th ult., aged 46.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE USES OF TEMPTATION.

BY THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE UNIVERSITY CHURCH,
OXFORD, ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 19TH, 1888.

"Tempted of the devil."—ST. MATTHEW iv. part of ver. i.

I CANNOT easily express in words—nor is there any reason why I should attempt to do so—the pleasure with which I undertake the task that you yourselves have imposed upon me this evening. I look back now through a vista of more than thirty years to the time when it was my lot and my privilege to speak Sunday after Sunday to a large body of Undergraduates. I felt then, and I feel still, that no congregation upon earth can be more interesting or more important. To influence those who must for evil or for good inevitably influence others in a very special and almost immeasurable degree; to claim the hearts and the intellects of the prime of England's youth for Christ and for Christian truth; to help young men to grapple with the difficulties which all young men must feel; to be permitted to believe that seed sown in simplicity and faith may fall, not only into *good* ground, but into the very best and most cultivated ground that exists all the world over, and there bring forth fruit a hundred fold—oh! there is no privilege, for one called to preach the Gospel of Christ, of higher rank than this! It is a comfort to me in my old age to know that Undergraduates are still willing to listen to such words as God enables me to speak.

And now, without further preface, let me go to the subject indicated by the few emphatic words which I have taken as a text. In truth, that subject is almost forced upon us, in some form or degree, to-day. The thought of Jesus Christ our Lord being subject to temptation, being submitted to a real struggle, coming off victorious, but not without effort and pain, glad to be comforted by angelic ministration when the battle was over and human weakness claimed repose—all this, taken in conjunction with another thought, namely, that this picture of a tried, suffering, victorious Christ, is plainly set before us in the beginning of the Lenten season as a pattern and encouragement to ourselves, all this tends to make us feel that a few thoughts concerning the temptation of Christ must be thoughts in season for to-day. I know, of

course, how wide, and deep, and difficult, is the subject thus opened out before us. I know how subtle are the theological questions involved. I know also how impossible it is in a single sermon to do more than touch a point here and there, and make a few suggestions, and draw one or two practical conclusions. But is not this just an indication of the grandeur and beauty of the subject? You visit some wonderful country, wonderful for its natural beauty, or its history, or its treasures of art, or its ancient buildings, or what not. You make your holiday tour, and you come back feeling that you have done little or nothing towards exhausting the wealth of the country you have visited. You have just touched the fringe of your subject; you have not had time to do more. Are you disappointed? Not in the least; you feel that your peep at Switzerland, or Egypt, or Rome, has really done you good; it has opened up new trains of thought, it has banished some ignorant imaginations; above all it has excited a keen desire to come again, and if possible to see and know more. So is it with the truths and the mysteries of God; you may visit them, and you may possibly return, as a man may return home from Switzerland, or Egypt, or Rome, as ignorant and as untouched in head or heart as before the visit was made; but if you *do* penetrate, be it never so little, below the surface of the truths and the mysteries of God, then you will have felt that your visit has done you good, that it has made you perceive how much more there is to be seen and known, and you will long to return to those truths and mysteries, in order that you may see and know more.

All this being so, I shall endeavour to condense what I wish to say to you this evening concerning the temptation of Jesus Christ crucified, by pointing out that in it there is a fact to be recognised as undeniable, a mystery to be acknowledged as inscrutable, and a lesson to be regarded as invaluable.

1. In the first place with regard to the fact. You may say, "Of course it is a fact, because the Evangelists assert it." Yes; but there are, as you well know, not a few persons, learned and thoughtful persons too, who do not at all recognise the witness of the Evangelists as putting an alleged fact beyond doubt; and what I should like, therefore, to press upon you is this, that even if you take such a view of Jesus of Nazareth as would satisfy Ernest Renan or Strauss, you do not get rid of the historical truth of the temptation. For my present purpose, I should not press any particular interpretation of the phrase, which refers the temptation of our Lord to the personal agency of an evil spirit. Grant any latitude you please with regard to the character of this agency. Let the phrase be qualified by the consideration that, on a subsequent occasion, when a temptation came from an Apostle, the Lord rebuked him with the words, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" Nay, for our present pur-

pose let it be even regarded as an open question, whether there exists a personal evil spirit or not. Grant all that the most sceptical mind can demand ; and still the temptation of Jesus Christ remains as a fact of first-rate spiritual importance in human history. To suppose that the thrice-repeated story has no foundation whatever, that it is a mere invention, can satisfy nobody. There must have been something real at the root of so remarkable an assertion made by the Evangelists concerning their Lord ; and what I wish to ask is this : "If you venture for argument's sake to reduce the Lord to merely human proportions, what may that something real be considered to be?" It seems to me that the answer must be of this kind, that He who is confessed to be the king of men, the head of our race, the author of confessedly the greatest and best and most lasting work for the benefit of mankind that the world has ever seen, was tempted to undertake His work in a false and unworthy way. Observe what the particulars of the alleged temptations were, and what a subtle character belonged to them, just because they involved nothing coarse, nothing dishonourable, nothing obviously wicked and profane. Observe, too, that they were made, not on the ground of human weakness, but expressly upon the high ground that Jesus Christ claimed in some sense to be "The Son of God"; not "because you are a man, and because human nature suggests this or that"—but, "If thou be the Son of God," turn these stones into bread, claim this kingdom, cast thyself down and trust to angels to bear thee up. If one may translate the temptations into general terms, it may perhaps be said, that in looking forward to His life's work, the Lord was tempted, first to shrink from bodily suffering ; secondly, to accept a kingdom of this world instead of one that is spiritual ; and thirdly, to become a fanatic, and to influence men as fanatics have done, and continue to do. This may or may not be a sufficient general representation of the character of the temptations ; but it is near enough to prove the point which I wish to press upon you, namely, that there was nothing obviously shameful and sinful in the things which Jesus Christ was tempted to do. If He had chosen a life not deprived of life's comforts ; if He had not been the poorest of the poor, without a pillow upon which to lay His head ; if, again, He had permitted the people to "take Him by force and make Him a king"; if He had placed Himself at their head like another and greater Judas Maccabæus, and had thrown off the hated Roman yoke, and restored the throne of David ; if, lastly, he had shown "signs from heaven," when He was asked to do so, and trusted simply to His miracles to force people to believe that He was the Son of God—who could have blamed Him upon any ordinary rules of human honour and high purpose? Might He not have been still the greatest of men, greater than Socrates

in wisdom, greater than Alexander as a conqueror, greater than Mahomet as a founder of religion, and yet have done every single thing that the devil tempted Him to do? Observe, I do not say that to have yielded to the temptation would not have been sin ; of course it would ; of course it must ; to do anything which we believe to be against the will of God, to have any aim short of the highest, to be weaker in spiritual power and lower in spiritual stature than God enables us to be—all this is sin ; but I wish you to observe that there was nothing mean, or degrading, or (as we say) unworthy of a man of honour, in that which Jesus Christ was tempted to do. He might have yielded to all the temptations, and yet have deserved the first and highest place in the world's list of heroes and benefactors. That Jesus Christ our Lord was thus tempted as a man, before entering upon His public ministry, that He resisted the temptations, that His ministry was precisely the opposite of the scheme which the devil suggested to Him, and that in this opposition is to be found one of the best comments upon His life, and the chief reason why the story of the temptation was deemed so precious by the Evangelists—all this I hold to belong to the region of established fact, even though the speculations of modern rationalists should be accepted as true. Am I wrong in pressing upon you that my text contains, whatever else, a fact to be recognised as undeniable?

2. But you and I, my Christian brethren, can find something in the words of Holy Scripture more and better than this. Undeniable facts are the stock-in-trade of historians ; they are invaluable in every kind of science, whether physical, political, economical, or what not ; they are as precious to a theologian as to any other inquirer ; but in its communion with God, and its knowledge of Him as a Father, Saviour, and Friend, the human soul needs something deeper and more living than undeniable facts ; and, therefore, I would press upon you, that in the temptation of Christ there is a mystery which must be acknowledged as inscrutable. I invited you not long ago to take for argument's sake a merely human view of the Lord Jesus Christ, to contemplate Him for the moment as man, and that only, in order that you might perceive, even upon such an hypothesis, the impossibility of regarding the temptation as a cunningly devised fable ; but now I say, Put aside entirely this uncatholic and even impossible hypothesis ; He who was tempted in the wilderness was, as you and I profess to believe, "Begotten of the Father before all worlds ; God of God ; Light of Light ; very God of very God ; . . . who, for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven." If all this be true, we are in the presence of an inscrutable mystery. I do not think that this consideration supplies any adequate reason for saying in a sceptical spirit "How can these

things be?" There are more things in Heaven and earth than are dreamed of in the philosophy of some of the wisest amongst us. It would not be difficult to cite examples of inscrutable mystery, even within the limits of that natural world which we have explored, and are exploring, with so much constancy and success. But the sense of the presence of a great spiritual mystery may rightly induce us to reflect upon the mystery with reverence, and try to apprehend if we cannot comprehend its meaning. When I have placed myself, so far as I can, in a posture of humble adoration—as did those heavenly creatures whom Isaiah saw in his vision—then what I see appears to be of this kind. I see one who has so identified Himself with the human race as to be capable of being "tempted as we are, yet without sin." I see one, who can be described without offence as being "compassed with infirmity." I see one whose temptation was so real and so true, that it gave Him an experimental knowledge of what temptation by the devil means, and so has enabled Him "To succour those who are tempted" as He was Himself. This is what I seem to see. Explain it I cannot; believe it I feel that I can. Aye, and I do believe it; and I press the record of the temptation of the Lord Christ to my heart as one of the most precious records that the Gospel contains. There may be times in the history of a human soul, when it is more profitable to contemplate Christ in the wilderness, than Christ on the Cross, or even Christ ascended into Heaven.

But though neither I nor any one else can explain the mystery of that union of the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ, which made Him at once weak and yet infinitely strong, capable of temptation and yet incapable of sin, still this remark is, I think, worth making, namely, that there are certain kinds of sin to which the temptations of our Lord did not extend. When I ventured some time ago to contemplate the Lord simply as a man, I observed that there was nothing obviously sinful and shameful in those things which He was tempted to do. A sin may possibly assume the shape of the "last infirmity of a noble mind." There are deeds, base, mean and contemptible deeds, temptations to which an honourable man can afford to put out of his calculation of spiritual dangers. And if this be so with men like ourselves, is it not at least worth observing, with reference to the mystery of our Lord's divine nature, what was the character of the temptations which Satan was permitted to offer to Him? There was nothing in them which argued the existence of a traitor within the fortress; nothing resembling that of which St. James speaks when he says, "every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed"; there was no being drawn away "of his own lust," no being "enticed" by the same impure agency, in the case of Jesus Christ; God forbid that we should think

such temptation possible! No; the devil found this out, when, after having finished his temptations, he left the Lord for a season; the angels who ministered to Him in His weariness and distress, when the devil had departed, knew that it must be so, and they found the human soul of Christ, faint though it might be, and was, from that weariness which human nature involves, as pure and bright and unsullied as the mind of God Himself.

All this does not help the mystery, does not get rid of it, is not intended to do so. There it is: it is part of the "mystery of godliness": better men and wiser than ourselves have accepted it, and found in it the very life of their souls. Why should not we?

3. And now I come to the point which, in a certain sense, is the most important of all. You will remember that I spoke of the temptation of Christ as containing a lesson which is to be regarded as invaluable. Let me press this point upon you.

Observe that the temptation of the Lord Jesus Christ is recorded evidently and distinctly as a part of, and a preparation for, His work "for us men and for our salvation." If one may attribute to Satan, as we commonly do, those feelings of spite and jealousy which belong to very evil men, then we may say that his joy would have been great in seducing from the path of holiness Him who was the holiest and purest of men. But the assault upon our Lord in the wilderness had in it a deeper intention than that of separating the soul of one holy man from God. It was the great work of Christ for the world and for mankind that was at stake: the ruin of the Gospel which Christ came to preach, and of the kingdom of heaven which He came to establish, was for the devil the prize of victory, if victory could be achieved. And, looking upon the matter from this point of view, we may note with interest that the temptation in the wilderness is the one recorded instance of definite preparation for His great ministry, on the part of Jesus Christ our Lord. Just notice, as you must often have noticed, how sparse are the evangelical records of the first thirty years of the Lord's life. The birth in Bethlehem, the adoration of the wise men, the flight into Egypt, the presentation in the Temple, the visit to the same at twelve years old—these are all the peeps that are permitted to us during the early years of Christ: for eighteen years—years which, in the case of ordinary men, embracing as they do school, college, the choice of a profession, the grappling with the real difficulties, and problems, and work of human life, are (as it were) the very central portion and pivot of biography—for these eighteen years the history of the life of Christ is an absolute blank. I presume from tradition, and from the shadow of a hint that we have in the contemptuous reference to Him as "the Carpenter," that He

followed Joseph's trade. I presume also from that other contemptuous expression, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learnt?" that He never sat at the feet of Gamaliel, or of any other famous doctor of the law. In fact, it may be almost assumed that if during those eighteen years there was anything material to be told, the Holy Spirit would have caused it to be put on record. No: those years are left blank by the evangelists because they *were* blank; blank of human incidents; blank of such events of preparation for the ministry as it was necessary for the Church to know. But one result of this great hiatus in the life of Christ is this—that it throws into marvellous and undoubtedly intentional prominence the temptation in the wilderness. Jesus Christ, it would seem, needed no instruction from the doctors of the law; that marvellous power of teaching, which the Sermon on the Mount and the Parables put in everlasting evidence, would seem to have been the immediate result of the Spirit which rested "without measure" upon Him; no academical preparation lay at the root of that wonderful ministry; yet there *was* a preparation, a preparation apparently so essential that the evangelists were not suffered to omit it, and that was that He should pass forty days and forty nights in the wilderness, "tempted of the devil"!

Now, this feature in the history of our Lord must of necessity be one of surpassing interest to all His disciples. No one who calls himself by the name of Christ can fail to be deeply touched by the thought, that "for our sakes," as the Collect of this day has it, He "fasted forty days and forty nights." No one who believes the story can fail to be touched by the entire condescension to human infirmity which it manifests, while he is amazed at the mystery of love which it reveals. But the special point upon which I desire to lay stress, in this congregation, is the lesson which it may give to young disciples of Christ with regard to their work in life, and their preparation for it. A University is, of course, a place in which it is expected that all knowledge shall be pursued and cultivated; its libraries, its museums, its professors, and all the apparatus of learning and research, are of the very essence of its constitution; but for young men, who come here for a few years, as their final school of learning, the University is emphatically the place of preparation for the work of life. Is it less a suitable place of preparation, is it not rather much more suitable and efficient, because it is possible for men to be tempted, aye, to be "tempted of the devil?" To say that in all circumstances, and under all conditions, temptation is possible, is only to say that which is obviously true. There was a time, perhaps, in the history of the world, when this could not be, and, therefore, was not. But that time was in the period of which geology teaches us, when the earth was the home of unreasoning creatures, and was in prepara-

tion for becoming the home of intelligent man. When man appeared, then the full glory of creation was manifest; but then came, with man's independent will, the certainty of temptation, and the possibility of sin. It is no paradox to say, that temptation by the devil is inseparable from the high prerogative of man. And if this be so, then certainly a place in which men are gathered together in the full flush of health and strength, and in all the joy of English liberty, is likely to be one in which temptation will be rife. I am not going to dwell upon the commoner kinds of temptation; I am not thinking of temptation in its coarser forms; I have been endeavouring to press upon you this great feature in the temptation of our Lord—that Satan never ventured to place temptation before His pure soul in any coarse, carnal, revolting form; he did not even suggest anything that could be classed as dishonourable or mean: and the lesson which I draw is this, that in preparing for the great work of life, men must not be content with resisting sin in its grosser forms. A man may do this, and yet may fail to use to the best purposes the time of preparation which God gives him. A man may fail to realise how great the work is for which he is sent to prepare himself, and so he may waste his time in pleasure and frivolity; he may avoid the deeper pools of vice, and yet be crippled for future usefulness. Especially is this so with regard to those whose purpose it is, by God's grace, to minister in His Church. Oh! how important it is that these men, above all others, should realise the subtlety of the devil; how important that they should perceive that to them, as to their Master, temptations may be presented which may not be shocking in their appearance, and yet may be fatal in their results. It is not sufficient that he who is to be a messenger of Christ, and a steward of the mysteries of God, should be respectable in conduct, and irreproachable according to the standard of ordinary society; the victory to be obtained over the temptations of the devil by him who looks forward to the sacred ministry, must be deeper and more signal than this; it must be a victory over secondary motives and principles, a victory over worldliness, a victory over idleness and love of ease, over all and everything which can stand in the way of entire devotion of the powers and faculties, which God has given, to the work which He has appointed to be done. You may take a much lower view of the battle which you have to fight than this, and no man may be able, or have a fair right, to open his mouth against you; but look to the spiritual history of those men who have moved the world; look at the history of the Apostles, or of such men as St. Francis of Assisi, or St. Francis Xavier, or Luther, or Wesley, or Henry Martyn, or Mackenzie, or Hannington, or any of those saints and martyrs who have fought the good fight, and are now before the throne of God. Nay, look

at the history of the Lord Himself, the Captain and Prince of all ; and then you will see how that it is by a death-struggle against the temptations of the devil, in all possible forms, that the real victory can be won, and the kingdom of God preached.

My Christian brethren, you will not all be called upon to preach the kingdom of God as ordained ministers of the Church. Nevertheless, either as priests or as laymen, you will have this work to do. The manner in which you will do it, the success which will attend you, the manner in which you will be able to look back upon your work, when your sun begins to go down, and the shadows lengthen, and you find yourselves nearing your long home, will depend very much upon the manner in which you prepare yourselves now.

"Tempted of the devil" you will be ; this is an integral part of your preparation. You need to be neither ashamed nor afraid. But brave and steady you must be ; fight and struggle you must ; overcome you may. And "To him that *overcometh*," saith Jesus Christ the Lord, "will I grant to sit with Me in My Throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with My Father in His Throne." Amen.

ON Wednesday, the 14th inst., Canon Harvey celebrated his ninetieth birthday. Notwithstanding his great age he not unfrequently attends the cathedral at Gloucester and takes part in the services. Among those who sent congratulatory letters was the Bishop of Manchester, his former curate at Hornsey.

THE Duke of Westminster has granted the use of Grosvenor House for the tenth annual meeting of the Church of England Burial, Funeral and Mourning Reform Association, on Monday, the 14th of May, and will himself preside. The Bishop of Manchester with the Dean, the Archdeacon and others will take part in a Conference on Burial Reform in the Mayor's Parlour, Manchester, on Wednesday, April 4th. The Mayor of Hull will preside at a similar Conference in Hull, on March 22nd.

A COMMITTEE has been formed for the complete restoration of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, and the preservation of its beautiful and unique monuments. All who feel interested in the work are invited to communicate with the rector, who will afford every needful information. The Church is open to the public daily (Saturdays excepted) from half-past eleven to two.

THE chapel erected by Mrs. Fraser at the cathedral in memory of her husband, the late Bishop of Manchester, has been completed by the erection of what the *Manchester Guardian* describes as an exceedingly beautiful screen, with folding doors. The cornice, which is of an elaborately carved vine pattern, is surmounted by a carved creasting. Between the muntins and above the doors, and on each side of the doors, is a variety of exquisite tracery, with battlemented transoms. The tracery of the panels below the lock rails is similar in treatment but worked on the solid of the panels. The lock rails and the door head are also elaborately carved ; while the principal stiles of the screen consist of very finely carved buttresses with pinnacle terminations.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE**, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains **ADVICE HOW**, in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation. **OBESITY IS CURED**, and will be, **gratis and post free**, on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1888.

THE OATHS BILL.

THE recent discussion on this Bill, and its second reading in the House of Commons, has once more brought the subject before people. Some few years ago, a similar measure was submitted to the Legislature and rejected. Since that time, however, the Atheist member for Northampton has taken the oath, on the Book which he does not believe in, and his seat. It is a little surprising to find that some of those who opposed the passing of the former measure—which was for the purpose of allowing Mr. Bradlaugh to take his seat—were found the other night going into the lobby with him in support of his measure on the question of oaths.

It is stated that the way in which the oath is administered in Courts of Justice is very often little better than a mere mockery, and savours more of a form than anything else ; but, surely, this is no reason why the oath, based as it is on the written Word of God, is to be set on one side ; rather should it be that those who administer it should by their very demeanour show that they believe in it, that it is a witness to the truth of God, and that he who swears by it is to "speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." And the further question arises, Will the solemn affirmation, which is to take the place of the oath, be any greater safeguard against perjury ? If the witness has some end to serve, and has no care for truth and veracity, what security have we that he will have any greater regard for the affirmation than the oath ? The whole question turns upon this one point. A witness comes into court to give evidence ; as a surety that he will speak the

truth he takes the oath; he swears upon the Word of God; it is an appeal to the Deity, and the force of this appeal is to deter men from saying anything that is contrary to the truth, because of the God of truth.

But the Bill which is now before Parliament not only proposes to make the taking of the oath in the Law Courts a voluntary matter; but it also proposes to allow members of Parliament, if they wish, to make an affirmation instead of taking the oath, before they can take their seats. It is true that this has been allowed in the case of the Quakers, but it is solely because they have a conscientious objection to oaths of any kind; yet, for all that, they believe most firmly in the Deity, and it is no subterfuge with them, far from it. If we are to do away with the oath, in order to please an Atheist and those who think with him, where are we to stop? We believe that there is a Chaplain for the House of Commons, who reads prayers at the commencement of each day's sitting, but if you exorcise God in the admission of members, surely it is out of place to call upon God in prayer before the beginning of each day's legislative work. It is a retrograde movement, and when once the principle is affirmed, we again ask the question Where are we to stop? The tide of Democracy is rising, and Socialism is boldly putting forth its nostrums and claiming to be heard; and if we as a nation agree to cast out the name of God, then we shall find that there are other and greater evils in store for us. We quite agree with the statement made by one member, when he said: "It was in the fear of God that the German Empire was founded, and it was for lack of that fear of God that the French Empire was destroyed." The oath is administered to members of Parliament as a pledge that they will maintain the laws of this realm and constitution, and to show that the laws are to be based on God's law. We condemn the man for stealing, and we send him to prison, but why? Because it is an offence against the Commonwealth, and it is necessary that thieves should be punished; but whence does the command first arise? Is it not because God has said Thou shalt not steal? and He who said this said also: Thou shalt have none other gods but Me. The Atheist, on the other hand, says there is no God, and wishes to get rid of Him and any mention of Him, by abolishing the oath with its appeal to the Deity and to the written Word of God.

We are glad to see that Mr. De Lisle, an occasional correspondent in our pages, has given notice that in Committee he will propose to add to the preamble that—"It is expedient and reasonable that a simple affirmation of persons of the persuasion called Atheists and Agnostics should be allowed in all cases where an oath is or shall be required by law." And instead of permitting a "solemn" affirmation upon a person "objecting

to be sworn," he will propose to permit a "simple" affirmation upon a person "declaring himself to be un oathable by reason of atheism or agnosticism."

Some have thought that one cause of the bad times that we are suffering from, depression in trade and agriculture, is owing, among other causes, that we as a nation some years ago decided that education should be carried on without any mention of God; and that, if the School Board so decided, the Bible was not to be read or taught in our schools. Be that as it may, we are afraid it may be said of us: If we decide to admit avowed Atheists to Parliament, to abolish the oath and also all mention of God, that the nation's glory has departed from us.

If any other member had introduced the Bill we should on principle have opposed it. Our hostility and dislike are increased by the fact that it is Mr. Bradlaugh's measure. He has made his living by infidel lecturing and denying the being and existence of a God; and if he should carry the measure it would seem to give the crown to his work, and will raise a chorus of applause in the columns of the *National Reformer*.

Righteousness, we are told, exalteth a nation—the Bible has been said to be the secret of England's greatness. We trust that our Rulers will determine that they will not allow the oath to be a thing of the past, and the appeal to the Deity ignored and suppressed.

THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY HISTORY OF IRELAND.

THE early history of Ireland is involved in great obscurity. Any attempt to separate the true from the false in the bardic legends could end only in failure. Yet those legends are of priceless value as indications of an early culture of no ordinary kind. Keating, who, though he has often been held responsible for the errors of his translators, remains still an authority of some importance on those early ages, tells us that the first name of the island was *Inis-na-fiodhbhaidh*, "a woody isle." It was also called *Crioch-na-fuineach*, or "the neighbouring country"; *Inis alga*, the "noble island"; *Eire* from a queen of the *Tuatha-de-Danaan*, a colony so named from their skill in necromancy. By them it was also called *Inis Fail*, from the *Lia Fail*, or stone of Destiny, which they brought with them into Ireland, on which their kings were inaugurated.*

According to the legendary accounts Ireland was visited some time before the Flood by Cesara, a niece of Noah, who led a colony thither, which perished in

* *Lia Fail*, see Vallancey, "Vindication of the Ancient History of Ireland" (1786), pp. 435-7. Vallancey gives a different meaning for *Crioch-na-fuineach*, *ibid.* p. 14. Keating wrote in Irish, and his work appears to have been a collection of many Irish MSS. into one volume.

the Deluge. Then the island lay waste until Partholanus, accompanied by his wife, with their three sons, and their three wives, and one thousand followers established a settlement.* The Nemeditians, so called from their leader Nemeditus, next invaded Ireland, and the settlement thus formed lasted for 217 years, when the Firbolgs came over and conquered the country. The new settlers divided the land into five provinces: Desmond, Thomond, Ulster, Leinster, and Conacht.

In the reign of Eochaidh, last sovereign of the Firbolg line, came the Tuatha-de-Danaan. This colony setting out from Greece first settled in Scandinavia, whence they crossed into Scotland, and having remained there seven years, next removed into Ireland. They were celebrated for their skill in magic, and are said to have introduced into Ireland the worship of the Sun and Moon.† Their dynasty held sway until the Milesians, after many wanderings both by land and sea, arrived in Ireland.

Terrible was the struggle between the new invaders and the Tuatha-de-Danaan, but, although the latter called to their aid all the resources of necromancy, arraying against their foes the demons of the Mist, the Storm and the Air, yet, in spite of all their sorceries, three Milesian chieftains made good a landing, and the Tuatha-de-Danaan routed in battle at Sliabh-mis and elsewhere, were forced to submit.‡

The Irish were undoubtedly a mixed race, partly Scandinavian, with an admixture from Spain and Gaul. The inferior kings were called Righ. The supreme king was termed Ard-Righ, or High King. The heir to the throne was called Tanist, or Successor. This office was sometimes hereditary, sometimes elective. The successor to the Ard-Righ was called Roydamna, or King Successor. Druidism was the state religion. The Druids usurped all offices; they were the Brehons, or judges, the physicians, teachers, bards, and priests.

The strong passion for military glory which urged the Romans to carry their arms into all lands impelled them to seek out the remote shores of Britain, and the coasts of Ireland were frequented by merchants, so that our information from this period onwards begins to be more reliable. In the middle of the 4th century B.C. Aristotle mentions Ireland, which he calls Ἰέρων. Strabo, too, has some curious information relative to the country. He says that the people were savage and given to cannibalism. The charge of cannibalism is also brought against the natives by Diodorus Siculus, and even by St. Jerome. Julius Cæsar tells us that the island is half the size of Britain, but he admits that his knowledge about it is very limited. Agricola received at his camp an Irish

refugee who sought his protection and supplied him with valuable information about the country, but more urgent business compelled Agricola to abandon the idea of invasion.*

Ptolemy, writing A.D. 120, gives us some useful information. From him we learn that the coasts of Antrim, Donegal and Londonderry were occupied by two tribes, named the Venicnii and Robogdii. The Shannon he calls Iernus, whence the name Erin was probably derived. The Erdini, Magnatæ, Auteri, Velibori and Gangani dwelt along the western shores, while the Iverni occupied the south-west and interior. The Usdiæ and Brigantes held the south. The Darini, Voluntii, Eblani, Cauci, Manapii, and Coriondi spread along the east, where were many and large towns. It would seem that at this period the island was occupied by different tribes, and those tribes not unlikely belonged to different races. In the north a Scandinavian element existed, while a connection may easily be traced between some of the other tribes and those of early Britain. From the 4th to the 10th century Ireland was known as Scotia, and its people as Scots.†

The early civilisation of Ireland has always been a favourite theme with Irish writers but while much that has been written upon the subject is mere declamation, yet we are not therefore rashly to conclude that the early Irish were cannibals and savages. The antiquities of the island in gold, silver and bronze, crowns, collars, bracelets, swords, spears, and domestic vessels, cairns with sepulchral chambers, ring money of gold, silver and copper, prove that at some period in her early history Ireland was colonised by a civilised people, who introduced, if not refinement, at least the elements of civilisation into the country.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

REVISION REPORT—THE LATE PROVOST.

SIR,—If you will allow me, I will say a few words in vindication of the late Provost's character as a theologian and a man, in both of which respects it has been singularly undervalued by the writer of the *communiqué* in your issue of March 3rd.

Setting aside theological subtleties, which are repugnant to the common sense of educated men, it would seem that the Anglican Church, when she declares in the 28th Article that, "The Bread which we break" (in the Holy Communion), "is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ"; that "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of a bread and wine), in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions"; that "The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner"; and that "The mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith"—it would seem, I say, to plain men, that

* The Book of Leacan gives a somewhat different account of the colony of Partholanus. Compare also Vallancey, "Vindication, etc.," p. 26.

† "It appears," says Vallancey, "that the ancient Persian mode of worshipping the Deity in Fire was the religion of the ancient Irish, and that this fire was contained in those towers now existing in Ireland."—"Vindication, etc.," p. 252.

This view has been exploded by Dr. Petrie, who refers the Round Towers to the Christian period between the 5th and 13th centuries. Compare Stokes, "Ireland and the Celtic Church," Lecture 12, p. 231.

‡ The name Scotia was given to Ireland by the sons of Milesius, in memory of their mother, Scota. By them it was also called Hibernia.

"Whenever in the first eleven centuries the term Scot occurs, it always means Irishman."—Stokes, "Ireland and the Celtic Church," p. 13.

* Tacitus, "Agricola," ch. xxiv.

† Ptolemy calls Ireland Iverna.

these words cut up the so-called "objective Presence" by the roots. For if the Body and Blood of Christ be "objectively" present in the bread and wine, then it follows that they are there when the bread and wine lie on the table after consecration, when they are taken in the minister's hands, when they are put by him into the hands of the communicant, and when the communicant puts them into his mouth. In that case they are *not* "given, taken and eaten," or received *only* after a heavenly and spiritual manner, but as a matter of physical necessity. Nor can faith be "the" means, as our Article says it is, "whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper." For the hands of the priest, and the hands and mouth of the recipient are the means, if there be such a physical incorporation as the doctrine of "the objective Presence" implies.

Brooke's Committee aimed simply at making this truth more apparent in that formula which is taught to children, which the Articles are not; I mean the Catechism. Nor is there one word in this report, drawn up by the late lamented Provost, to sanction the idea that Christians can, in ordinary circumstances, receive the benefits of Holy Communion, without receiving the Communion itself.

The argument, based by your correspondent on the Sarum office for the sick, fully stated, is this: The Sarum office teaches the possibility of receiving the Body and Blood of Christ, without reception of the elements of bread and wine in certain cases. But the Sarum office was used in a church which held transubstantiation. Thereupon, no argument against "the objective Presence" can be derived from the similar teaching of our office for the Communion of the Sick.

This argument would be good enough were it not for the numberless inconsistencies or even contradictions involved in Roman Catholic doctrine; *e.g.*, It is taught that absolution by a priest renders the soul perfectly clean and bright and pure, like that of an angel. If so, what need of extreme unction, which, as the Council of Trent teaches, "if there be any delicts still requiring expiation, and remains of sin, wipes them away"? And what further need of purgatory, the very name of which implies (what the Council does not, however, explicitly teach) that the sins of the faithful (who alone are received into it), still require expiating, even after absolution and extreme unction have wholly wiped them out.

The fact is that the teaching of the Sarum office on the possibility of the sick receiving the Body and Blood of Christ without receiving the consecrated elements is a relic of the ancient and purer doctrine of the Latin Church, with which the gross doctrine of Transubstantiation, first laid down by authority in the Latin Church in A.D. 1215, and which has never been really accepted by the Greek Church, is in direct contradiction.

Though the Report of Brooke's Committee was not adopted by the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, the object of it, so far as the Eucharist is concerned, was carried out in the subsequent revision of the Prayer Book, set on foot by Dr. Salmon; a question and answer having been inserted in the Catechism, taken from the words of the 28th Article. The insertion of these words is the unpardonable sin of the Church of Ireland in the eyes of a certain party in the English Church, who can bear without a murmur the dislocation of the services in the American Prayer Book, its mutilation of the Canticles, its ignorant

improvements of the language, its omission of the Athanasian Creed from its service, nay, even the complete erasure of that creed from the Prayer Book and the Articles; its expunging in the Visitation office every mention of confession and absolution, but cannot endure that children should be taught in plain language what is taught in the Articles regarding the Eucharist. And this is why your correspondent has volunteered a notice of Dr. Jellett, the late Provost, which, to me, as to everyone who knew him and therefore valued him, appears utterly unworthy of his grand character.

For the late Provost was really a "grand old man." He was a man utterly incapable of the smallest deviation from truth, no matter how indirectly; a man of the utmost generosity of character; a man who never said a bitter or nasty thing of any adversary; who never failed to do full justice to every adversary; who scorned to take advantage of his position to crush those he could not answer; who never substituted a sneer for an argument, nor ever said anything intended to wound. He was a man of the deepest and tenderest sympathy; who, in all his strength of logic, never undervalued or depreciated the claims and merits of others.

And the impression he made was accordant with his noble character. His sermons, to which I am glad that I have this opportunity of calling attention, are the carefully thought out productions of a clear and vigorous and deeply reverential mind. Some of them rise to a high degree of that noblest eloquence which consists not in the adorned expression, but in the intensity with which the convictions of the writer are presented. I will instance in his last volume, the sermon on Remorse; a sermon which no youth, hesitating on the brink of profligacy, could hear or read without being checked and sobered. Unlike some other sermons, perhaps of equal ability, Jellett's leave on the mind the conviction of the writer's absolute sincerity. He does not say what he does because he is bound to say it, but because he feels it. He is not speaking to a brief.

Dr. Jellett was, of course, only secondarily a Theologian: his prime function was the exact sciences. As a pure mathematician, he had few equals; his book on the Calculus of Variations received the unusual distinction of being translated into German shortly after its appearance, and is, I believe, still used as a text-book in foreign universities. For his researches on subjects connected with the polarisation of light, he received the large gold medal of the Royal Society some years ago, and up to the last he kept abreast with the progress of discovery.

His sudden death (from such a cause) has left a void in the Councils of the Church, where his advice was potent, because it was almost invariably sound and always sincere. In the hearts of his friends he will never be replaced.

C. P. M.

GUARD THE PASS!

SIR,—In most battles, like that of Waterloo, there is what is called the key of the position, on the holding of which the victory depends. Now the present contest turns on the nature of the presence, and more especially on the part the bread holds in the Eucharist. The Romanists, and Romanisers like Dr. Littledale, hold that there remain only its ap-

pearances. This is one flank of the foe ; the other holds that the bread is no means at all, faith being the only means.

Now, sir, do not, I pray you, dismiss this as merely an Irish question. It is no such thing. Lord Ebury and his party are quite as anxious to get rid of bread and priest as our Irish revisionists were in our deplorable Synod. The whole question must be sifted to the very bottom, examining carefully both the 28th Article and the definition of a sacrament in the Church Catechism.

1. The 28th Article says, "the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean whereby it is received and eaten is faith." Now observe that, as our Lord called the bread, in some sense, His Body, while St. Paul says that the bread is the communicating medium of bestowing His Body, we have body in two senses, the outward means or vehicle, and the inward grace or gift. It must be of the inward grace or gift that the Article says it is given, etc., "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," for the bread which also our Lord, in some sense, calls His Body, is received grossly and carnally, and the means by which it is received is our mouth—the inward gift then it is of which the Article says, that it is received only in an heavenly and spiritual manner ; and the means on our part, is that devout frame, called faith, but more fully explained in the last answer in the Catechism, "to repent truly," etc. As to the inward grace or gift being "given," etc., only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, Bishop Geste, in his letter to Cecil, says that a man may subscribe these words, excepting merely the one word "only," still holding a gross corporal presence, because the corporal presence being invisible, it may be said to be after an heavenly and spiritual manner. But "only," shuts out Romanists and Romanisers because they hold that there is a presence in a natural manner, though hid from our senses. A Romish archbishop from America, preaching in Dublin lately, spoke of "the sacramental Godhead"! This is startling ; but it is equalled by what our Irish Church paper had lately, that "adoration of a ninety-places-at-once Presence is fairly based on Scripture and virtually enjoined by the Black Rubric." What is to be adored must be the Deity and "the sacramental Godhead." So there is a perfect unity here.

2. Now we turn to the party of Lord Ebury and our own revisionists, who would get rid of bread as a means by which the grace of the Eucharist is bestowed. This object is to be read all through the famous report already referred to *ad nauseam*. But this is totally opposed to the definition of a Sacrament in the Catechism, "An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us"—here some say that "given unto us" refers to the sign, and others have it that it refers to the grace. But that is of no consequence, because what follows settles the matter I have in hand : "an outward and visible sign . . . ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." Thus we see that the bread is ordained by Christ Himself as a means ; and yet we had here in Ireland a body of clerics and laymen who decided that the bread is not ordained by Christ to be a means, but that faith is the only means. Talk of Rome saying that there is no bread at all and that the wine is not to be used, though ordered by Christ ;

but how is this worse than our Synod ruling that the bread ordained by Christ as a means is no means at all? Alas! that a question and answer with such intent should have been thrust into the fair work of the Hampton Court Conference, defiling it with what comes very near, at least in purpose, to actual heresy.

3. Those who produced this wretched question and answer, overlooked the fact that, when a gift is transferred there must be two parties, the devout receiver and the hand of God stretched out. God, our revisionists were willing to acknowledge, and the stretched out piety of man ; but that God should use a hand on His part, even the priest or minister, and the bread—this, they would not hear of. For this reason they would not use the words of the Article, "given, taken, and eaten." This seemed to require the minister and the bread, but yet, really, "given, taken and eaten," would suit the idea that the gift came *immediately* from God to the soul of man. But because "given and eaten" seemed to require minister and bread, the words must be excluded, though the friends of truth in the Synod told their opponents that, if they shrunk from saying that "given and eaten" were to be understood only in an heavenly and spiritual manner, Rome would triumph and say that, by our own admission, "given and eaten" are capable only of a corporal explanation. Recourse was had to the indefinite words of the Catechism, "taken and received," as not requiring any factors but God and the man's soul. I will not touch upon the mess made by the language used in our Preface, as that has been already worn threadbare by letters on both sides in your columns. If more occurs to me, or is made necessary by arguments on the other side, I may be obliged to trouble you again.

A CATHOLIC, BUT A TRUE PROTESTANT.

"THE OUTWARD AND VISIBLE SIGN OF AN INWARD AND SPIRITUAL GRACE GIVEN UNTO US."

SIR,—In the Holy Communion, bread and wine are the outward and visible signs of the Body and Blood of Christ, and are means whereby we receive that inward and spiritual grace. They are a means on God's part, but on man's faith is necessary, whereby the soul grasps and feeds on the grace thus given. There are therefore two distinct means, and on this point it may not be too presumptuous to say, that there is a decided want of further explanation in our Church Catechism. To speak of the manner of reception is a totally different thing from that which is received. The grace received, and the manner by which it is given, refers to God ; the manner in which the grace is received, and the mean whereby it is received, refers to man, and is stated to be faith. But faith in what, or faith about what? If it is merely faith or belief, that with the bread and wine as a means there comes direct a grace from God into the heart of the recipient, that faith or belief is necessary, but it is not all, nor nearly all ; there is something more required, and that most important, for though we may say that there is a want of further explanation on this point, still the last answer in the Catechism furnishes perhaps a reply to such a statement. There we find a definition of the faith required by the recipient, which will undoubtedly prove the mean on his part, whereby the inward and spiritual grace will be given unto him in that holy Sacrament. The true

repentance for sin that is past, the steadfast purpose to lead a new life, and to be in perfect charity with all men, will spring from that lively and steadfast faith in God's mercy through Christ, accompanied with a thankful remembrance of His death, which is the mean whereby the Body and Blood of Christ are received and eaten to the soul's everlasting life. This lively faith is the mean on man's part, which is referred to above, and is the essential requisite which those who come to the Sacrament must possess, if they hope to get that for which they come. So far no mention has been made of any officiating priest. But is it that such is considered as an unnecessary agent in the ordinance? Far otherwise! God acts through agents and through means, as our Saviour has taught us when on earth. And so His Sacraments are dispensed at the hands of His ordained ministers. God alone sends the inward and spiritual grace, but He does so at their hands, and through the means ordained by Himself. Were these matters more clearly understood with reference to the two Sacraments of our Church, and specially with that now referred to, it might help to lessen the number of those who, through ignorance of its being a means of grace (which is perhaps the most charitable hypothesis to assume), so very frequently turn their backs on what is not only a source of strength and refreshment to their souls, but is also their bounden duty and service.

INQUIRENS.

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—The three articles on "Darwinism and the Christian Faith," which appeared lately in the *Guardian*, and which the Rev. George Henslow, himself an evolutionist, so ably reviewed in your columns, should not be allowed to pass without any further comment than the letter of my old friend "H.W." You, sir, by admitting a discussion on "Evolution," some years ago, in the PULPIT, have anticipated that which is now going on in the pages of your contemporary, and it is possible that a change has come over some of your former correspondents in their estimate, if not of evolution, at least of the increased hold it has gained in men's minds. The world of thought has moved rapidly since the publication of your leading article in April, 1883—"Evolution not opposed to Christianity." The number of its adherents has largely increased. It is leavening the minds of our rising generation at school and at college. It enters into all sorts of publications. It has been ably advocated at the Reading Church Congress. It appears in the Hulsean Lectures for 1884 of Dr. Bonney, and in the Bampton Lectures of the Bishop of London; it underlies Professor H. Drummond's widely-read book "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," and it is most simply and clearly handled in the admirable "Essays and Addresses" of the Rev. J. M. Wilson, head-master of Clifton College. I name these books only as they happen to be before me as I write. Evolution is no longer, as some would fain hope some years ago, an Ishmael turned out into the wilderness, but a Jacob, a "supplanter" of the obsolete doctrine of independence of species. The whole world is going after it.

Yet not altogether. The correspondence going on in the *Guardian*, anent "Darwinism and the Christian Faith," shows still resolute antagonists. The old argumentative weapons are drawn out of the armoury and

refurbished. They are vigorously handled; but they have lost the keenness of their edge. They have become rusty and obsolete. Dr. Randall and the Dean of Chichester—the latter a former contributor to the PULPIT—represent phases of argument, which are either inept in the eyes of evolutionists, from "childishness and absolute want of acquaintance with the subject" (*Guardian* for March 14), or from confounding—to quote the words of a former opponent of evolution in your pages, Dean Reichel—inspiration with infallibility. Evolutionists may well reassure Dean Burgon that the acceptance of Christianity as a rule of faith and morals is perfectly compatible with regarding the early chapters of Genesis as symbolical or allegorical, or, as I should prefer to consider them, traditions of the ancient Accadians purified of Polytheism and stamped with the divine seal of Hebrew monotheism. Revelation is a gradual process. The spirit of religion, as exemplified by Judaism and Christianity, is progressive development. To bind down scientific thought, which is knowledge of nature, by what was written, most probably, for a very different purpose in the days of its ignorance, is to impose a yoke more intolerable than that which St. Paul broke long ago. As a mediæval scholastic thesis, the Dean's letter deserves praise, as a convincing argument it is quite beside the mark.

To return. Many of the clergy are beginning to look hopefully at evolution, as both the right explanation of the processes of nature, and as a more powerful line of argument on behalf of religion than that of Paley. The Rev. George Henslow shows it in the case of Paley's watch. Evolution as nature's method has undoubtedly awakened the enthusiasm of scientific men, who have thrown themselves heart and soul into the study. It has come as a great joy to many in their perplexities about the endless variety and provoking similarities of species. We may yet live to see such an enthusiasm for evolution among the clergy. But it must be founded on God. It must be God's work. For be it said at once that evolution without God is not worth the having. It is an insult to our deeper convictions, a hollow mockery. The greatest enemies to evolution are those who eliminate Him from His magnificent work, who would substitute the means, be it survival of the fittest, or any other process yet to be discovered, for the last word in evolution is very far from being yet spoken, for the fount and source of all. It is this dark shadow athwart evolution as cast by some of its prophets, which has hindered many from accepting it. When it becomes clearer than it now is that teleology is the golden thread from the throne of God which runs through the process of untold ages, and is present in every change, as the *αἰτία δραστηρὴ*, or efficient cause, then we may hope that the religious world will be fired with the enthusiasm of naturalists.

F. T. P.

REGENERATION AND CONVERSION.

SIR,—The proximity of Holy Week, and the fact that the time and thoughts of your readers, no less than my own, will be occupied with matters far removed from newspaper controversy, even on such serious questions as those raised in your last issue, must be my excuse for answering very briefly the strictures on my sermon made by your two correspon-

dents. I trust that my briefness will not be misinterpreted as discourtesy.

"Presbyter's" first difficulty is entirely of his own making. He assumes that because I spoke of regeneration as an "ecclesiastical" term, I denied its "theological" meaning. But nothing was farther from my thoughts. "Presbyter" says: "In the hands of a divine who knows his terminology, *ecclesiastical* is antithetical to *theological*." I cannot, in the face of Mr. Sandlands' strictures, presume to speak as "a divine who knows his terminology," but I may still be allowed to demur to "Presbyter's" statement. That "ecclesiastical" may be opposed to "theological" is plain, but either word may be used alone without any suggestion of such antithesis. They *may be* antithetical; they are in no sense necessarily co-relative. If we speak of "ecclesiastical" vestments, it would be unfair to challenge us to produce "theological" vestments. An "ecclesiastical" court is not the antithesis of a "theological" court, but of that most untheological of all bodies, a court properly called "civil." I notice that Mr. Justice Kekewich, in giving judgment on the Tooting Chapel case, is reported to have said, "You cannot make a 'conversion' (using the word in a lawyer's sense, and not in the *ecclesiastical* sense), without the consent of all." Even "Presbyter," when he writes in the *Ecclesiastical Review* does not feel bound to exclude "theological" subjects. A little later "Presbyter" substitutes "ontological" for "theological." Are these terms the same?

As a matter of fact I was distinguishing the Church's use of a theological term from the new meaning read into it by the followers of John Calvin. The English Church in her formularies clearly speaks of "regeneration" as the gift of Baptism, "Seeing now this child is by Baptism regenerate;" Calvinists as clearly distinguish the two. The following passage from Article xx. of the *Consensus Tigurinum* is sufficient to quote: "*Qui in primâ infantia baptizati sunt, eos in pueritiâ vel ineunte adolescentiâ, interdum etiam in senectutē regenerat Deus.*" This was of course connected with the belief that though many were "baptised," only the elect were "regenerated," a view irreconcilable with either our Baptismal Service or the Thirty-nine Articles.

With regard to "Presbyter's" other questions, I can only say that my object was to draw a clear distinction between two terms, of which the first has a definite meaning fixed by ecclesiastical usage; while the second is a vague term which, though it is hard to define, cannot mean the same as the first. I did not suppose myself to be writing a theological treatise on Regeneration, or the relation of the Sacraments to the Incarnation, nor had I any new views of those great questions. Yet it would be impertinent in me to refer a brother priest to the ordinary channels of theological information. But I may say, in answer to one of "Presbyter's" questions, that it is inconceivable to me that any sane Christian, not holding the Calvinist view of "irresistible grace," could first confuse "regeneration and conversion" as Professor Drummond does, and then speak of the "unregenerate" (*i.e.*, in his language the "unconverted") as having no spiritual nature.

I find nothing to answer in Mr. Sandlands' letter. He seems to wish to "traverse" my views, and apparently believes he has done so. But of the few definite statements he makes, there is none I cannot assent to. Perhaps I should except the sneer with which his

letter ends, and which seems to me, if I may say so, uncalled for. My object was to clear up confusions in untheological and uninstructed minds. So far from supposing that I have succeeded admirably, I am conscious that even in Mr. Sandlands' case I have entirely failed.

AUBREY L. MOORE.

Oxford, March 20th, 1888.

BANNS OF MARRIAGE—A SCENE!

Parson: I publish the banns, etc. If any of you, etc.

Parishioner: I object.

Parson: Meet me in the vestry.

SIR,—“These things,” as St. Paul says, “I have in a figure transferred” to Dr. Littledale's publication of banns between our Church and that of Rome.

1. When the objector meets the parson in the vestry, he proceeds to state objections, near relationship, affinity, under age, or either party having wife, or husband, living. So I am now to show that the ground, on which Dr. Littledale founds his notice for a marriage between the Churches, are utterly false.

2. Rome, he tells us, does not *now* say that the substance of bread has vanished, leaving only the appearances, look, taste, etc. This is false, as she still says exactly the same as before. Canon 11 of Council of Trent rules that the substance of bread gives place to that of our Lord's Body, the appearances, etc., of bread alone remaining. Now let us see what Dr. Littledale brings forward as a ground for union, on Rome's side. “Whereas they formerly taught that only mere phantasms of bread and wine survive after consecration.” Most true! This is what they taught at Trent. “Now,” he says, “the received teaching is that no physical change whatever is effected.” Does he say this? No, but “that none, of which the senses can take cognisance.” Pooh! this is exactly what they said before. The mere phantasms remaining unchanged, the senses could not detect the change of substance. “No change of which the senses can take cognisance is effected by consecration.” Exactly so! This is what Trent said, and all their books and catechisms say still, “But that all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist remain as they were before.” How any man of learning or common sense could state, as two, one and the same position, trying to show a difference where there is none, is almost beyond belief, only that seeing is believing. Having now stated the false grounds for union, on the Romish side, next we turn to those on our side.

3. “This”—that the substance is changed, but accidents remain—“this,” he says, “is the Anglican doctrine.” They remain in their very natural substance. This passage “is the Anglican doctrine expressed in the Black Rubric in other but equivalent language.” As the Black Rubric says that it is “the sacramental bread and wine that remain still in their very natural substances.” Dr. Littledale's assertion, “that what the Black Rubric says is that the appearances alone remain, the substances having vanished,” this is the most astounding mis-statement that I have ever seen. The absurd cry of tattlers of appearances, of accidents remaining in their substance, when substance accidents have none, is beneath contempt.

4. As the representations on both sides are utterly false, I forbid the banns, and the marriage cannot take place.

AN AFFLICTED RELATIVE.

ON Saturday, the 17th inst., Dean Elliot, of Bristol, completed his eighty-eighth year.

THE PROPOSED 5 PER CENT. REDUCTION IN THE TITHE RENT CHARGE BILL.—In the course of an article on the Tithe Question the *Economist* of Saturday has the following observations in support of the above proposal:—"If the clergy are so anxious for these changes, and if these changes are in themselves so beneficial, surely they will not be unwise enough to repeat the tactics pursued last year by the Bishops in the House of Lords. Lord Salisbury's Bill, in changing the actual incidence of the tithe from occupier to owner, proposed to allow the landlord to deduct 5 per cent. from the payment to be made by him. To this proposal the advocates of the interests of the Church objected. They argued, the real incidence of the tithe always has been, and always must be, in the last resort upon the landlord. The farmer is nothing but the conduit pipe through which the tithe flows to the clergyman. If the law merely enacts that in future the owner of the land shall not be allowed by contract with a third party to make the clergyman first look to that third party it is not doing any injury to the landlord for which he ought to be allowed compensation as is proposed. From this line of argument we entirely dissent. Theoretically, no doubt, the landlord is bound to pay the tithe, for tithe is a burden on the land, and all burdens on the land must in the end attach to such ownership. In practice, however, the fact that the landlord in many cases does not pay the tithe, but has, by contract, cast that duty upon the tenant, will make the change act upon the landlords very hardly. The farmers will be relieved of the tithe. When, however, the landlord attempts, as he will have a right to do, to add the tithe to the rent, the farmer will assert that it is absolutely impossible to pay what he is asked, and will declare that he is not going to stand having his rent raised—for so he will regard it. The landlords know this, and naturally, will very much prefer to keep things as they are. But even supposing that the farmer agrees to the nominal increase in rent, the landlord will still suffer. Say a landlord has a tenant who pays him £1,000 a year rent. The tithe paid by the farmer on his holding is £100. After the Bill has passed, the landlord will pay this tithe. Say that he adds it to the rent, and receives from the farmer for rent and tithe all lumped together £1,100. Next year, however, the landlord has to make a fresh reduction of 10 per cent. on his rent. When the farmer paid the tithe this reduction would have meant a loss of £100 a year. Now that the tithe is added to the rent, it will mean a loss of £110 a year. Naturally, the landlords do not welcome very eagerly the notion of a reform, which will bring them fresh liabilities of this nature. Accordingly, unless they can be in some way or other induced to accept the change, they will fight hard against it. The clergy will be acting most unwisely if they do not recognise this fact, and do not make the best terms they can. Looked at in a commercial spirit, it is well worth the while of the clergy to give up 5 per cent. of their incomes, in order to get those incomes paid, not only promptly, but generally in one or two large drafts, especially if, in addition to these advantages, they acquire a new power to enforce the payment of their property—are enabled to substitute the personal wealth of the owner of the land for the land itself as security for their incomes."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adamson, Rev. J. Bardell, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Foleshill, Coventry; Vicar of St. Michael's, Burleydam, Cheshire.
 Alpe, Rev. Pretheroe, B.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Limehouse.
 Bass, Rev. T. J., Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society for the Archdiocese of Canterbury.
 Booker, Rev. Arthur Wellington, Vicar of Croxton, near Grantham; Rector of Sutton Veny, Wilts.
 Braithwaite, Rev. P. R. P., M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Jersey; Dean of Jersey and Rector of St. Helier.
 Burges, Rev. Ward Travers, M.A., late Vicar of Farnworth, Bolton; Rural Dean of Edgmond, Salop.
 Cochran, Rev. Algernon Home, M.A., Rector of Radwell, Herts.
 Colson, Rev. Francis Tovey, M.A., Senior Curate of St. John's, Reading; Vicar of Christ Church, Warley.
 Cooke, Rev. George Robert Davies, B.A., Vicar of Hythe, Hampshire.
 Courtney, Rev. Stanley Thomas, Vicar of Bullington-with-Tufton, Hampshire.
 Dombain, Rev. James, Perpetual Curate of St. John's, Chadderton, Lancashire.
 Etchel, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Chaplain of the Poplar and Stepney Sick Asylum.
 France-Hayhurst, Rev. Thomas W. Hamilton, M.A., Rector of St. Wilfrid's, Davenham, Northwich; Rural Dean of Middlewich.
 Francis, Rev. David, Perpetual Curate of St. Ann's, Ynysyhir.
 Hart, Rev. J. W. T., Curate of SS. Philip and James, Cheltenham; Vicar of St. Paul's, New Swindon, Wilts.
 Kitchin, Rev. Barclay, Curate of Basingstoke, Chaplain on her Majesty's Bengal Ecclesiastical Establishment.
 Loveband, Rev. Walter, M.A., Vicar of Ifield, Sussex.
 Matthew, Rev. Murray A., Rector of Buckland Dinham, near Frome.
 Muller, Rev. James Theophilus, M.A., Assistant Inspector of Schools in the Deanery of Carey.
 Phillipson, Rev. William Wynne Burton, M.A., Vicar of St. Michael's, Burleydam, Cheshire; Vicar of St. Paul's, Foleshill, Coventry.
 Price, Rev. R. E., Rector of Llanymynech; Rural Dean of Oswestry.
 Quirk, Rev. George, Rector of Yarmouth, Isle of Wight.
 Ranson, Rev. Simon Mortlock, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Alban's, Streatham Park.
 Reed, Rev. William, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
 Snepp, Rev. Ernest Henry, L.Th., Rector of Edmondsham, Salisbury.
 Sparks, Rev. Francis Monkhouse, Vicar of Ulting, Essex.
 Street, Rev. Arthur J., Rector of Brockley, Bristol; Rector of Talaton, Devon.
 Williams, Rev. Henry John, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Pontypridd.
 Wynter, Rev. George Ellis, B.A., Rector of Buckland Rippers, Dorset.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blathwayt, Rev. Charles Welfitt, for nearly forty years Vicar of Chelmarsh, at Eastbourne, on the 17th inst., aged 73.
 Egerton, Rev. John Coker, Rector of Burwash, on the 19th inst., aged 58.
 Harrison, Rev. John James, Retired Chaplain R.N. and Naval Instructor, at Underwood House, Hornsey Lane, Highgate, on the 17th inst., aged 70.
 Keith, Rev. W. A., M.A. Oxon, at Burnham Vicarage, near Rochester, on the 15th inst., aged 59.
 Nelson-Ward, Rev. Horatio Nelson, for thirty-five years Rector of Radstock, near Bath, on the 13th inst., aged 64.
 Ridley, Rev. Nicholas James, at Hollington House, Newbury, on the 15th inst., aged 67.
 Sutton, Rev. Walter Henry, M.A., at Freeland Parsonage, Oxford, on the 11th inst., aged 59.
 Symes, Rev. William Stallard, at Tilbury, Great Yeldham, on the 7th inst.
 Wilson, Right Rev. William Scot, Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway, at Ayr, on the 17th inst., aged 81.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TOUCHSTONE OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 26TH, 1888.

"And when the young man heard that saying he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions."—ST. MATTHEW xix. 22.

THERE is one thought that never should be absent from our minds as we study the life of Christ on earth, and that is that Christ lives on earth still. "I am alive for evermore," is the word with which the risen Christ greets the beloved disciple who had known Him in the days of His flesh. "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," is the word with which He sends forth the founders of His kingdom. "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them," is the word with which He proclaims His abiding presence in the Church which is His body upon earth. And when we speak of the presence of Christ upon earth, and His living amongst men, we mean, surely, something more than and something very different from that living amongst men, which, in a certain sense, we ascribe to all great leaders and teachers of men. There is a life amongst men that the author lives in the minds of his readers; that the great leader lives in the minds of his followers; that the law-giver or the conqueror lives in the history of the nation upon whose laws and whose history he has stamped himself. In this sense, and in a very true sense, mighty men of old, men of renown, live still; the sceptred-dead still rule us from their urns. But when we speak of Christ living amongst men, we mean more than this. We mean a living personal presence of His Spirit, a presence implying a will and a purpose and an action of Spirit upon spirit, which, because it is spiritual, is the most real of all things. We cannot put a lower or a lesser meaning upon the promise which He has given, read in the light of His resurrection and His ascension, that He who rose again would dwell amongst men for ever. And, then, with this thought we should always join another, viz., that whatever our Lord was in the days of His flesh, that and nothing else He is now. The perfected humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ, just because it is perfect, can know no change. The two kinds of change that our imperfect humanity knows—the change of growth which implies that at one time there was imperfec-

tion, and the change of decay which implies that imperfection is beginning—these two, His perfect nature can never know. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. And from this it necessarily follows, that whatever He was, or whatever He was for anyone who met Him in the days of His flesh and held converse with Him, the same must He be to anyone now who resembles, and just in so far as he resembles, that person. So it is that each type of humanity that comes before our Lord Jesus Christ—into the presence of that light that reveals and manifests—each human soul is made to reveal itself to us and to all time, as it shall stand one day revealed in the great white light of the judgment throne—as he comes into the presence of the Saviour who is to judge, and who judges now that He may save. It is not this or that man conversing with Jesus of Nazareth that we see or hear, but it is humanity in contact with Christ, the sons of men speaking to the Son of Man. And so we see, in this point of view the whole story of Christ's life on earth and of His words becomes, not by way of poetical allusion or metaphor or strained interpretation, but in very real and deepest fact, a parable and a prophecy—a parable of the whole life of humanity as acted upon by the Spirit of Christ; a prophecy of the history of Christ's Church all along the ages. Still do the scenes in Christ's life repeat themselves amongst men. Still does He go to and fro upon the earth as once He went to and fro among the cities and villages of Palestine, and as He passes along the ways of the world now, the sick, and the suffering, and the sinful, gather themselves around Him, drawn by an irresistible attraction; now here and now there disciples rise up, and forsake all that they have, and follow Him; Pharisees hate Him, and Sadducees mock Him, and cunning Scribes ask Him cunningly devised questions, and Pilates contemptuously judge Him, and misguided multitudes are stirred up into passionate rejection of Him; still there are quiet Bethanies where the Son of Peace finds peaceful resting-place, and Publicans and harlots gladly come to Him, and weeping sinners kiss His feet. Yes, in a wide sense, if not in the highest sense, but surely in a very wide and very real sense, there is that about which men wrangle so hotly, and define so rashly as regards one and one sense only of it—surely in the widest sense there is still on earth a Real Presence of Christ. Now if this be so, and we hold that it is so, it will be profitable for us to-night to consider one instance of an approach to Christ and converse with Him. To look upon this scene in Christ's life, of the young man coming near to Christ, is a lesson to you all to-night. In the first place, let us look at the broader outlines of the picture, before we consider its details. What is it that we see in this picture? We see, in the first place, the central figure, always in these pictures, Christ. And then close

around Him we see the inner ring of His own true followers, who have left all to follow Him, those who love Him, and yet who vex Him by their imperfections, by their rivalries, by their jealousies, slow of heart to understand who He was and what He said to them, and yet whom He loves, because they love Him, and are willing to give all for Him. And then outside these, again, the outer ring of the great gathered multitude—some gathered from curiosity, some from passing interest, some scornful, some hostile, none believing, none ready to rise up and follow Him. Then, from time to time, out of this outer ring of the multitude, thus hostile or careless, we see starting forward one of the multitude, and he draws near to Christ, and for a moment he seems to mix himself with the inner ring of Christ's disciples. Drawn to Christ by some irresistible attraction, he feels that at that moment he must have speech with Christ. And then he says to Christ some word, and he hears from Christ some word, that leaves him never again the same man that he was before. It draws him and binds him to Christ for ever, as His follower and His disciple, or it sends him back again into the outer multitude, never, perhaps, to come again nearer to Christ, his Lord. We see this, as I have said, in many and many of the pictures in our Lord's life, and surely this is a scene that repeats itself still. Wherever Christ is there is still near to Him not so easily discerned as then, but really separated from the surrounding multitude, an inner circle of those who love Him, and who have given and are ready to give everything for Him; and the outer circle of the multitude that look upon Christ and His disciples as something, it may be interesting or curious or admirable, but something that in no way concerns their practical and daily life, and as regards which they have no thought whatever of forsaking all that they have for His sake. And then from time to time, now as then, there does come upon the soul of some one in that multitude an attraction that draws him as it were in spite of himself to Christ. He feels that there and then his soul must have speech with Christ; there is something that he has to say to Him that he must say, some question that he must ask, some request that he must prefer, some entreaty that he must make, and in that hour there is a crisis for his soul, in that hour he draws nearer and closer to life, or goes further and further from life and Christ. Is it not so? It may be so with some one of you here to-night. It may be that more than one among those to whom I am now speaking, has felt this attraction to Christ before now. It may be in the course of this sermon some word said for Christ may send some young man upon his knees to his Saviour. It may be some word from a friend that he loves, or an acquaintance that he respects, or some sentence in a book has struck him, or some event in his life that has startled him. Be it what

it may, for some reason or other that young man has been brought, as he was never brought before, face to face with Christ. And if that has happened to anyone here, then you have felt this, that there was a real power of Christ upon your soul, and as you drew near to Him you entered upon a crisis of your fate. A better man or a worse man you were from that moment, and which it is you know, and God only knows beside. So far, then, the story, as I have said, repeats itself. Now let us look a little more closely into the picture, and see what is told us of this young man who draws near to Christ, that we may discover what manner of man he was. In the first place, he manifestly was one whom we should now speak of as of the upper classes, of the well-to-do portion of society, for we are told that he had great possessions. What more do we know of him? He has no sickness, no disease that he brings to Christ to heal; he has no sorrow; he comes neither pleading for himself nor anyone else who is suffering; he does not cry out "Come, ere the being that I love dies." No subtle intellectual difficulty troubles him, he has no difficult question to put to Christ that he wants a solution for. No great sense of sin, even, moves him. He tells our Lord that He has kept the commandments from his youth up, and our Lord evidently recognises the truth of this saying. So moral and worthy a young man is he, that we are told that our Lord loved him. And he is not troubled with sceptical doubts. He believes in the eternal life to come, and in a life that it is worth making some effort for here to gain. He has a longing to do good in his day and generation, for he asks "Master, what good thing shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" This is the type of the young man who comes to Christ, and I believe—I honestly and truly believe—that he is the type of a very great number of those who are listening to me to-night. Of course in this large gathering here to-night, which represents the great University of Oxford, which is in itself a mirror of England, there must be many types of youth, as in any great gathering there must be many types of men. There may be here, to-night, for instance, the earnest, enthusiastic, if somewhat narrow, religious dogmatist who believes that his small party or his little school in the Church has all the truth, and that its triumph would be the triumph of Christianity itself. And there may be the equally narrow and enthusiastic anti-religious dogmatist, who believes that he has made the great discovery that there is no truth except scientific truth, and that the faith of his childhood is only obnoxious superstition. And there may be here, I am sure there is here, more than one honest, earnest doubter, doubting, craving, desiring to believe, and yet distressed as he faces for himself—as all earnest men will one day have to face, the old-world problems of thought and life, so old to the race, so new and distressing to each individual of

the race—who doubts desiring to believe. And there may be here to-night the less earnest and less honest doubter, whose doubt is half affectation and half reality, who has picked up his doubts out of the last magazine or last article in a review, the free-thinker who has yet to learn to think. And there may be here the frivolous young man, for whom life is merely a round of athletic or social amusements. And there may be here—is it possible that there may be here?—one of a lower type of young man, the fast young man, so called, and rightly called, because his feet have been swift to tread the foul and miry ways of the world, the knowledge of which he boasts—the youth with a young man's head and an old man's heart, a graduate in vice, a master of profligacy. There may be such possibly, but I believe that not one of these can fairly be said to represent the great majority of those here, who represent, I doubt not, the great majority of English life and thought, and I believe that this is still healthy and sound. I believe that the great majority of those to whom I speak are young men with healthy minds in healthy bodies, with the spirit of careless happiness and comparatively unvitiated purity of early manhood, young men who have not lost the faith of childhood, young men who still bow the knee reverently to Christ, and are conscious of desires to be something better than they have been, and yet not prepared to give up altogether for Christ, all but disciples who are willing to say to the great Master, "Tell me, for my guidance, what am I to do that I may inherit eternal life." And now, if that is the case, and I fully believe that it is the case, let us in the next place see what was the answer that Christ gave to this young man. Our Lord loved him, and yet what a hard word He spoke to him, a word that had the effect of driving him away in sorrow and in disappointment, and yet a loving word. What was that word? "One thing thou lackest yet; sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and come and take up thy cross and follow me, and set thy treasure in heaven." And he went sorrowing away. The word of the loving Lord—a testing, searching word, because it was a loving word—drove him away. Now, what is the meaning of this word of our Lord? Does it lay down as a universal condition of membership in Christ's Church, that they who become Christians shall share their goods alike? Is communism the law, and the essential law of discipleship in Christ's Church? If it were we should have no reason to complain, for the treasures of heaven were cheaply purchased even by poverty on earth. But as a matter of fact this is not the condition that Christ lays down for universal discipleship in His Church. When Matthew, the publican, made Him a great feast in his house, he was not bidden to part with the wealth that purchased the feast. There was no command to sell the ointment for three hundred pence to be

given to the poor. The rich man, who found him a grave in his death, had not been compelled, as a condition of discipleship, to part with the ground in which the grave was dug. Our Lord makes no law of communism the law of His Church. Our divine Master was not guilty of the economic mistake of trying, out of those physical and mental inequalities which God Himself has made, which cannot be altered, and which are really the base and ground and origin of social inequality, to make an absurd and impossible effort for universal social equality. Once only was this tried in the early history of the Christian Church. It was tried in Jerusalem, when men sold their goods and laid the price at the Apostles' feet, and the same history shows how great a mistake that was, when we read of an Apostle afterwards bringing to that very Jerusalem a collection for the poor saints that dwelt there. Communism is not then the law of the Christian Church. What was it then that Christ meant to teach this young man and us? We learn it from the effect of our Lord's words upon this young man. He went away sorrowing. Why? Not because he had great possessions merely. Many a man has parted with great possessions—with the greatest of all, his life—gladly and cheerfully for Christ. Why did he sorrow when Christ asked him to part with these great possessions? Because they happened to be those things that were nearest to his heart; because they were those things which he preferred to the treasures of heaven, and our Lord, who saw this, who reads all hearts, asked him to give his great possessions, not merely because they were great possessions but to give Him that which to give required him to give his heart. "My son, give me thy heart," is the word of our Lord to all who come to Him, and He tests their willingness to follow Him by asking for some one or other treasure, because He knows that where the treasure is there will the heart be also. Our Lord, in fact, told this young man the great truth, and the great law and the great condition of all membership in His Church. It is this—My religion is a religion of sacrifice; there is a cross in my religion, and it is not only the cross on which I am to die, but the cross which he is to bear, and on which He is to be crucified who shall follow me. "Take up thy cross, and follow me." Therein lay the testing and searching nature of our Lord's word, and not merely in saying, "Thou hast great possessions, sell them and follow me." Yes, our Lord requires that those who come to Him shall be crucified ones, as well as that they shall believe in the crucified One. Why? Why is it that our Lord says to everyone of us, if you are to follow Me, the crucified One, you, too, must be crucified? For this reason, that He has come to save His people, not from the consequences of their sins—He never came for that—but He has come to save us from our sins, from our sinful selves. What is sin?

Sin is a selfish indulgence of self against the law of God. Sin is, in other words, an incapacity for self-denial. It is this that makes men obey the desires of the flesh and the mind, because they cannot deny themselves the gratification and the pleasure of obeying, and the obedience to them is a treasure and a great possession, and that is why our Lord says, if you would be saved, you must cast this self out of your religion. You must crucify—it may be by a slow and lingering and painful death—but you must crucify your own and baser self. Of your own dead self you must make a stepping-stone to rise up into the higher and eternal life. Sacrifice thyself that thou mayest be saved from thyself, and from thy sin. This is the full meaning of the cross of Christ, and those who preach only a cross that we are to look at and be saved by, and not a cross that we are to die upon with Christ, preach only one half of our religion. It is a true word they tell you that you must look at the cross of Christ, and believe in what He has done for you there that you may be saved, but that is not all the truth. Our salvation is something more than, and something more painful than the mere spasm of passing, momentary conversion, followed by a comfortable assurance of salvation for the rest of a man's days. God forbid that we should disparage or deny the possibility of instantaneous conversion. Many a soul has come to Christ in that way, but what we say is this, that he who in that or any other way comes to Christ, comes to One who will save him from his sins, and that not only has he to contemplate the work of Christ for him, but he has bravely, unshrinkingly, patiently, resolutely, to endure the work of Christ in him and on him; and he who cannot do this, who has not the courage to endure this, cannot be saved. Now then we see what it was that Christ required of this young man, and what it is that He requires of us. And now again let us picture some young man coming to Christ, coming, as I have said, stirred by some thought of what Christ has done for him, and willing to do something for Christ. As that thought has stirred his heart, he has felt that there is something in the life of Christ, and in the words of Christ for him the most real of all things; that the story of the Gospel is something else than a story to be listened to in the form of lessons in the Chapel, or got up in the form of studies for a divinity examination, but that the things that it tells are for him the most vital, the most awful, the most precious of all things, that his very life and very soul depend upon it, and so there has come to his heart for the moment, the thought of the old hymn, the *Dies iræ*, and he has said if not in words, yet in thought to his Saviour:—

Tu pro me sedisti lassus
Tu pro me sis crucem passus

Ne sit tantus labor cassus
Jesu, recordare me!

And as these thoughts pass through his heart, the words of his creed, till then cloud-like, are turned to pillars of fire, and the forms of his prayer are become real supplications, and his aspirations after a better life are become earnest resolves, and he has come to Christ and said "Teach me, guide and help me, that I may inherit eternal life." And now, in the last place, let us consider what is it that Christ will require of such a young man. Some one or other of his great possessions. The young man went away sorrowing, because he had great possessions. What were these? Not, surely, money. Money is not the great possession of the young man. Comparatively few young men care about it. Avarice is not the young man's vice, whatever extravagance may be. No. Nevertheless the young have great possessions. There is not one here that I am looking at that does not own great possessions, aye, possessions that we older men have lost long ago, and that we are tempted to envy you young men of—youth itself, the most precious of all possessions, that doubles and trebles every other in its enjoyment; youth in the freshness of life's morning, like the early dew that falls upon the earth that grows dry as summer's dust, in the weariness of age; the very novelty and charm of life, the vigour of intellect, the pride of manhood, the strength of body, and the freshness of emotion that makes air, earth and skies an opening paradise to the young. We old men, as we look back upon these things, envy you young men your great possessions. What does Christ say to you? Give all these to me. First give them all in the purpose of thy life, and then any one of these from time to time, as I may ask it. Take of these but two, and they are specially precious possessions of the young man. One is pleasure. The capacity of youth for pleasure soon passes away, as men grow old and life loses its zest, and we come to the days when we say we have no pleasure in them, for youth is the season of pleasure. "Rejoice, oh young man, in the days of thy youth," and then suppose that Christ asks from some young man here to give Him this. He requires of him for the sake of His religion to turn aside from some pleasant society, to give up some pleasant friendship or agreeable companionship because he feels it is injuring his soul's life, to give up the study of some kind of literature, not altogether bad, perhaps, and yet having within it such delicately compounded poison of impurity, as may be poisoning his soul's life with a slow and corrupting poison; or to give up some favourite indulgence, that he may help some weaker brother to struggle against it, then and there that young man has met his Saviour, and there and then his Christ has said to him, "Give up this possession." Or take another thing that young men prize much, and that is popularity. Young men are sensitive, as old men are not sensitive, of the opinion of their fellows. As we get on in life, there grows up around us an inner

circle of close interest, of near relationship, of family ties, of pressing duties, of daily cares, across which barrier the opinion of the outer world comes faint and far off. But the young man is singularly open and sensitive to the opinions of those round about him, and to offend his set, to make himself ridiculous in the eyes of those who are his daily companions, to stand up, and for the sake of the Lord who died for him to say one brave, honest, stern word of rebuke of a foul word or irreverent jest—to do that, and to do it for Christ's sake, God knows, how trying and bitterly painful that must be to the young man. And when that trial comes to you, Christ is saying to your soul, "One thing thou lackest yet, give me this thy possession, and take up thy cross and follow me." And whatever be the thing that Christ asks of us, be sure at the moment it will seem to be a great possession. The very demand for it makes us reluctant to part with it; and so with all the possessions of youth, the time will surely come, if a man is in earnest about his religion, when he will be called upon to give up some one or other of them for Christ. And then mark the danger of such a moment. The thing that he is asked for may be very small apparently. A great duty stirs and elevates a man's soul, and he girds himself to accomplish it; but the small thing, the almost unnoticed thing, that comes to him in the daily current of ordinary life, that is so easily put aside as small and trifling, in that very thing may be the crisis of his fate. Older men will tell you this, men that have come to look back upon their lives in the long and lengthening shadow of the past: they tell you this, that it is perfectly startling to see how very small may be the event that may affect the whole future of a man's life. A chance word, a chance meeting, a moment too soon or a moment too late for an appointment, may affect the whole current of life, just as the stone or clog that a child may lift, may send a stream miles and miles away in some far off channel distant from that in which the parent waters flow and seem as if they would flow for ever. A very little event may change a man's whole life, and in that very little event he may meet Christ. And yet the sin of rejecting Christ, and the danger of rejecting Christ, is as great in the small things as in the great. And, oh, just think what may be the after-course of him who turns away from Christ at such a moment. His soul has stood at the parting of the ways, a very small angle of deflection at first, and yet an ever-widening divergence. As he passes out into life, its cares, its ambitions, its riches, its sorrows, its disappointments, fill the mind, and he has less and less time to think of what once filled a large space in his mind; and so he goes on and on, he has gained the habit of postponing the things of the next world to the things of this, and his religion becomes more of a form and the affairs of this life more of a reality, and further and further off and dimly and yet more

dimly seen is the Christ of his childhood, and fainter and fainter grow the echoes of the prayers that he once said at his mother's knee, and duller his memory of the voices that he once heard, and the soul of the man, drowned in pleasures and cares, sinks downwards, as a drowning man does, wavering still more weakly at each struggle till he perishes at last. There comes a hardness of heart and a contempt for God's Word and commandments that are the portion of sinful age; there comes the paralysis of the will, and the dumbness of the soul that fain would pray as once it prayed, and can find no words of prayer, and the man is dead and reprobate, and between him and his Saviour stretches out the long, the almost impassable, gulf of a careless and godless life. Or if, by God's infinite mercy, the man should be awakened from such a condition, with what painful strivings, with what tears of blood, with what pangs of a new birth, does he struggle again to new life. And then what has he to offer to his Lord? The dregs of a wasted life and the imperfect repentings that God at the last may of His great mercy give him. That is all, and that is his best. Oh, young men, hear the earnest and affectionate advice of one who cannot look unmoved on such a gathering of young men as this. Young men, rejoice in the days of your youth. Great are the pleasures, and great are the joys of youth, and God has given them to you largely to enjoy. Rejoice in the days of your youth, but put them to a right use; use them for Christ's sake and for God's sake, and in the full purpose of your heart devote your nascent life to Christ, say it shall be all His, and that whatever He asks from time to time that shall be His too. You may have sorrow and pain in going to Christ—not the sorrowing of going away, but the real, honest pain and sorrow that you would have in taking up the cross, in coming to Him; but that sorrow, like other sorrow, will grow less and less on repetition, and easier and easier it will be to make the sacrifice that Christ requires, and greater and greater will be your joy as you make it, until at last the time comes when you, in your turn, must part with some one of those great possessions. They are stolen away from us day by day and year by year, and the time must come, for you and for us all, when we must leave the possessions, if they have not left us. Well is it for the man who then once more can hear the voice of Christ, the voice that he has been hearing and following all his life, the voice that for the last time will say to him "One thing lackest thou yet, and that is the rest prepared for thee, and the glory of the perfected life. Thou who hast died with Me, thou who hast suffered for Me, thou who hast followed Me whithersoever I went, come up higher, possess and enjoy with Me the treasures of heaven, for which in thy lifetime thou didst give the treasures on earth." God grant that for you and for me, and for all of us, for Christ's sake.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1888.

RELIGION AND ART.

THE subject as to how far art should be made the handmaid of religion, is one which has often exercised men's minds; and it is one upon which there will always be some divergence of opinion. It is a matter of thankfulness that we have got beyond the narrow puritan exclusiveness of former ages, and are no longer content to worship God in mere barns—ecclesiastical barns—but have found that it is possible to worship God in temples made with hands, and in which everything that is of value is offered unto God; and this adorning of the sanctuary is found to be a help to devotion, instead of as some would imagine tending to draw the mind from God, or leading us back to superstition and idolatry. This desire for improvement in architecture, is seen not only in our English Churches, but also among the various Nonconforming bodies we find they are discarding the old style of building which satisfied their forefathers; and that stained glass windows and gothic buildings are now the rule and not the exception, in fact, there has been an improvement all along the line of churches and chapels. But it is not in the exterior of the building that we find art asserting itself so much as in the interior. A few days ago, the beautiful reredos in St. Paul's Cathedral was unveiled, and was highly praised as a work of art. It will, no doubt, have a tendency to help devotion; and ultimately, we suppose, that the dome and other parts of the cathedral will be adorned with paintings and frescoes, which, if wisely treated, will give a tone and dignity to the building. Only the other day the Bishop of London, speaking at the consecration of a church,

said that "There could be no question that these two arts—music and architecture—were so closely linked to religion, that it was inevitable that really good music and good architecture must ultimately make their way." Art, if only properly used, may be made the handmaid of religion.

We see no objection *per se* to the introduction of Scriptural paintings into our Churches, provided that they are placed in proper positions and are of a subdued colour, so as not to distract and draw the mind from the main thoughts which should engross the minds of worshippers; and especially would we urge this in poor Mission Churches, and places where the unimaginative may be led to contemplate some aspect of our Lord's life and work on earth. The preacher may be very eloquent, and a descriptive word-painter, but all the eloquence in the world will not touch the imagination so much as some pictures. We remember hearing a clergyman say that looking at a stained-glass window, with its representation of the crucifixion, had taught him a very great deal, and if we go into the Doré picture-gallery, what teaching power there is in some of its lovely pictures? Further, we teach our children by the eye, by means of pictures, and from them they learn many lessons. And when we come to speak to the great mass of people in this busy work-a-day world, so engrossed with the cares and anxieties of the daily life, on spiritual subjects, we find that they are mere children, and need instruction, and therefore the judicious introduction of paintings will be of help to bring home to them the truths of our holy religion. In support of this we might quote the words of Mr. Sedding, uttered at a conference some time ago, who said, "Have you no trumpery 'ecclesiastical art' reredoses concocted of boxed mud, tiles, British stones and scabbled monograms which no one understands to replace with good pictures or sculpture?" a sentiment which many will agree with, because if the one is allowed, why should not the other? All things in the Church are to be for edification.

The whole system of teaching by the eye is now taking a fresh turn, and if pictures are rightly used they may be of great help. Turning to another point, we notice that Church history is now being taught by means of dissolving views, a plan which we have often advocated as a means of showing what has been done, bringing vividly before men's minds the past work of the Church. So, again, in Holy week; we have found pictures of the events recorded in the latter chapters of the Gospels, and brought before people by means of magic lantern views, to be of wonderful value, a deep silence being felt, especially when the crucifixion is thrown on the screen; but it is all part of one great whole, the bringing before men solemn truths by means of the eye. So, in the same way, if art is used rightly, she can be of immense service in helping men to realise those old themes of the

Gospel narrative, and in this way have a wonderful teaching power.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—To my letter of last week I wish to add a few remarks on the idea of evolution in former times.

Opponents of the theory cannot fail to notice that, at the present day, modern scientific research in the five branches enumerated by Mr. Romanes (*Guardian*, March 14), viz.: Classification, Morphology, Embryology, Geographical Distribution, and Palæontology, place evolution on a very different basis from the guesswork and imperfect presentation of olden time. Lamarck and Charles Bonnet (A.D. 1764) had not the material at their command for forming a correct judgment on the subject much less those who preceded them. And yet it is a curious fact that, if we turn to savage nations, a crude theory of evolution is a feature of their myths of creation. Mr. Andrew Lang, in his highly interesting work, published last year, "Myth, Ritual, and Religion" (see vol. i., pp. 166, 251), instances a tribe of Digger Indians and certain Australian ones, who suppose that men and beasts were slowly evolved and improved out of the forms, first of reptiles, and then of quadrupeds. He gives it as his opinion that "all cosmogonic myths waver between the theory of construction and the theory of evolution very rudely conceived." Many myths declare that man was evolved out of one or other of the lower animals. In Peru an Indian was not looked upon as honourable unless he could claim some such descent. Animal worship may have sprung from this idea. At any rate, a crude evolution is of great antiquity.

Turning to Greece, we look almost in vain for a distinct idea of evolution. It is a bold fancy which asserts that evolution may be the golden chain which Jupiter, as Homer says, ordered to be let down from heaven to earth. The mythical marriage of Ouranos and Gaia, animal and plant metamorphosis, and the doctrine of atoms, only show that the idea of definite creation and of fixity of species did not exist. Truth is, Greek philosophy, when it emancipated itself from mythology, was more eager to discover the ἀρχή, or beginning of things, than to work patiently on true scientific lines. The result was a series of brilliant guesses, readily embraced and as readily discarded. Of the two courses open to philosophy, as Dr. Whewell says in his "History of the Inductive Sciences," the experimental and the notional, or verbal, it chose the latter. Philosophy plunged into dialectics.

The great fault of Greek philosophy was want of verification. The brilliant genius of the idealistic Plato, probably influenced adversely his great disciple Aristotle, and prevented him from fully following out his intellectual bias, which was experimental. Of all the ancients, Aristotle approaches nearest to Bacon's objective method. But his theory was better than his practice. Evolution was no part of his system. No wonder that Mr. W. F. Kirby, in his "Evolution and Natural Theology," says that as the ancients had not the least conception of geology and

the allied sciences, the very idea of evolution could not exist. "It would certainly not be a presumption in favour of evolution that it was accepted as a truth, but rather the contrary."

Of the five branches of science enumerated above, one at any rate was known to the ancients. I allude to morphology. If we turn to the great medical writers of Greece, we find that morphology led them very close to the theory of evolution. Hippocrates, the father of medicine, to whom Plato and Galen looked up with admiration, has thrown out the most scientific suggestion of all antiquity in the direction of evolution. In his work, "De Victus Ratione Sanorum," Book i. 3, he speaks of universal physical principles, and attributes elemental activities to heat and moisture in their various combinations. He then adds: "This being so, they differentiate from one another numerous species and of every variety, both of germs and of living things, presenting no likeness to one another either in appearance or in potentiality. Now, whereas they never remain fixed in the same proportions, but are always in process of change, it necessarily follows that dissimilar germs and species should arise, and they that spring from them should be further differentiated." These physical principles, he says, apply to mankind as well as to other forms of life. His generalisation, the fruit of acute observation, was probably derived from morphology. Certainly Galen, who worked out his principles and who never sacrificed facts to dialectics, repeatedly draws attention to the fact that anatomists, who dissected the bodies of dead infants and of monkeys, were persuaded that their structure was analogous. "Of all animals monkeys are most like men in their organs, muscles, arteries, veins, nerves, and osteology." He is persuaded that all animal forms are the work of one mind, their bodies being adapted in all respects to their mode of life. He is constantly tracing out physiological similarities. Morphology was his great study. At the same time, the tone of his mind was eminently devout. He abjured heartily the Epicurean idea of a fortuitous concourse of atoms forming an unguided and godless world. On the contrary, in his great work, "De Usu Partium," he is constantly pointing out the wonderful contrivance, exquisite adaptation, and harmonious working of all the parts of the human body. This he calls the δικαιοσύνη τοῦ δημιουργοῦ. "We honour Him more," says he, "by tracing it than by offering holocausts at His altar." It filled him with a divine inspiration, and he calls his work above-named a "hymn to the all righteous Creator." At the same time, the evidence before him compelled him, as our evolutionists at the present day, to conclude that God works by means, and not by the simple utterance of His fiat (Bk. xi. 14). Galen considers the opinions of Epicurus, Moses and Plato on the genesis of the human race. The first he rejects with scorn, the second with respect. Speaking of the Mosaic account of creation of man out of the dust, he says: "To Moses it is enough that God should will to set matter in order, and straightway it is done; he deems all things possible with God, even though He should wish to turn ashes into a horse or an ox. We dissent from this view; we maintain that there are impossibilities in nature; God does not attempt them, but out of existing possibilities He chooses the best." This is Galen's definite position, which he holds reverently but firmly. In it, as in the quotation from Hippocrates before, we see that, as far as their knowledge went, they were on the side of

evolution. If to this be added that they believed in the indestructibility of matter and in the antiquity—myriads of years is the expression—of the earth, we must allow that they were not far from modern scientific conclusions.

With your permission I should like to add a few lines in your next issue of the PULPIT on the account in Genesis in relation to evolution.

F. T. P.

REVISION REPORT.—THE LATE PROVOST.

SIR,—I observe with gratification that a correspondent of yours, who writes with authority, as a friend of the late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, admirably defends the character of that eminent man against what are little else than aspersions upon it in a recent pretended *éloge* in your columns. That obituary notice was little but a rehash of old letters in your paper, about the revision of the Irish Prayer Book; whether by the same writer or not does not appear, although the author of the obituary abstains from the very improper accusations of *mala fides* made by your old correspondent against the leading people of the Irish Synod. There is, however, in to-day's paper a renewed attack by "A Catholic, but a true Protestant," on the addition to our Catechism. We are told by him that our Synod ruled "that the bread ordained by Christ is no means at all"; means, that is, by which sacramental grace is received. This statement is unfounded. The Synod never ruled anything of the kind. The Synod ruled that the new question and answer should be placed in the Catechism, and ruled nothing else on the subject. Your correspondent seems to think that by adopting a recommendation contained in Master Brooke's Committee's Report, the Synod adopted every inference, good and bad, honest and dishonest, sensible and absurd, that a person, writing fifteen years after the transaction, chooses to make from his interpretation of the contents of the Report.

The question and answer are taken (at least the answer is) from the 28th Article. If they contradict other parts of the Catechism, the Article contradicts it too. The Article says that faith is "the mean" by which the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is received and eaten; the Catechism, by which the Body and Blood are taken and received. "The mean" imports that faith is the only mean. Your correspondent contends that this is inconsistent with the antecedent part of the Catechism, which teaches that the elements are a means whereby we receive spiritual grace. He does not understand that words can have different imports in different places. "Means whereby we receive the same" declares that the elements are the vehicle by which grace is conveyed. *Mean whereby our Lord's Body is received and eaten, or taken and received*, does not apply to, or refer to, a vehicle; for a vehicle by which food is eaten means nothing whatever. Your correspondent "Inquires" says what is equivalent to this in another form; "to speak of the manner of reception is a totally different thing from that which is received."

What is the use of repeating, time after time, with no argument but repetition, unless imputation of bad faith be an argument, a conjectural history of the mental process by which the authors of Master Brooke's Committee's Report evolved it? And what is the use of your new correspondent talking about

"our deplorable Synod," and "this wretched question and answer"? Does he want to convince people of anything? If he has got anything to say that is worth saying, to say it once in a logical form, stating his opponents' arguments as they really are, and not giving his inferences from them as their arguments, will serve his purpose better than fifty such letters as that of to-day. In any case, to discuss some subject of present interest would be more to any comprehensible purpose than to go over the history of a question settled to general satisfaction half a generation ago.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

24th March, 1888.

REGENERATION AND CONVERSION.

"An outward and visible sign, of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself."

SIR,—Permit me to offer a few remarks on this subject. The above, being the definition of the word Sacrament, as given in our Catechism, let us see how it applies to the first of the two Sacraments of our Church, viz., Baptism. Here water is the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace, or, of a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness. It is the means on God's part whereby that inward and spiritual grace is conveyed to the person baptised; but on the part of the person baptised, there are also means required, viz., repentance and faith, whereby he steadfastly believes the promises of God made to him in this Sacrament. We have then here the two distinct means: water on God's part, and on man's, repentance and faith. The Giver, God, of the inward and spiritual grace, viz., a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness; and the receiver, man, who through repentance and faith does qualify himself for the blessings of Baptism. This grace, conveyed to him through the means of water on God's part, the baptised person must believe he receives. Here then we arrive at the question, why are infants baptised before they can exercise faith and repentance? Can we suppose for a moment that if water, the means ordained by Christ Himself, whereby the inward and spiritual grace is given, is duly used in the Baptism of infants, that God would withhold from them the blessings of Baptism because they are incapable of exercising the necessary means, on their part, for obtaining them? Or is it that the means on their part, viz., repentance and faith, which they cannot exercise, are unnecessary? By no means. Their sponsors, who solemnly answered for them, promised that, on their arrival at the years of discretion, they would themselves exercise that repentance and faith which in infancy was impossible. And further, we cannot suppose that any unfitness, or after neglect on their sponsor's parts can prevent the work of grace by God in the infant's soul, which itself opposes no hindrance to it. The form and sacrament of Baptism having been duly performed, infants are as truly regenerated, meaning thereby pardoned from all taint of original sin, and adopted into the family of Christ, as is the repentant and believing adult, who openly and in his own person declares his repentance and faith before he receives the rite of Baptism. To confound conversion with regeneration shows an ignorance of the meaning of the words, since to talk of infants being converted were utter nonsense, because infants are incapable of exercising the two essentials of conversion, viz., repentance and faith; and in the

case of adults, to make conversion the same as regeneration were to make that for which the adult comes to baptism, viz.—pardon and adoption, the same as those requirements, viz.—repentance and faith, which he must have before baptism. Indeed, such a confusion of the two words would show an ignorance hardly pardonable, when a correct knowledge of the Catechism, not to mention the Articles, should prevent it. Regeneration simply means pardon and adoption, which the Sacrament of Baptism, duly administered, confirms and ratifies. Conversion means a turning to God, exhibited by a true repentance, and accompanied with a steadfast faith in God's mercy through Christ. To keep these two words quite distinct in their meanings might not only prevent most erroneous ideas on the subject of Baptism, but might also tend to dispel a certain cautious fear which the very term "baptismal-regeneration" almost invariably kindles in the minds of many church people whose ideas on the subject are far from being either definite or settled, and who often use the word as a mere party "shibboleth."

INQUIRENS.

SIR,—Canon Moore's sermon in your number for the 10th March leads to a good deal of thought. "With Presbyter's" criticisms I agree. It seems strange to speak of mankind being regenerated by the Incarnation. The regeneration of the world is referred to by our Lord as future—for which the whole world groaneth, being in bondage. Bishop Bethel, treating of regeneration in baptism, says it is not a change of nature, but of relation to God. This applies to infants and adults alike.

2. The Incarnation is now spoken of in an extraordinary manner, not, I think, known of formerly. I see not what authority Canon Moore has for saying that "the regeneration of collective manhood was the work of the Incarnation." "Presbyter" may well doubt what this language means—Scripture neither explains nor asserts it. I doubt not all this new language about the Incarnation is built upon the idea that, in the Eucharist, our Lord's natural body is corporally united to ours. This has no foundation in Scripture, or in the Prayer Book. Mr. Lawrence's idea that the Holy Ghost is Incarnated within us is another step in this progress in language and ideas equally incomprehensible.

3. Canon Moore introduces another idea unknown to the Prayer Book, viz., that private confession is a duty incumbent, at least, on the death-bed. The Prayer Book speaks only of those who are unable to quiet their own consciences, and require further comfort; such are to open their grief as to any particular matter. The minister is to examine only as to whether a man truly repents of his sins. There is no ground for Canon Moore's making private confession a duty on a death-bed, no more than anywhere else, much less for such questionings as are sanctioned by "the priest in absolution" and such other Crypto-Romish books.

ONE WHO KEEPS TO THE OLD LINES.

Questions like the one which stands at the head of this letter ought to be discussed calmly and dispassionately. It is a vital question, and on its right solution depends, under God, our eternal destiny. Once for all, then, I would like to say that I disclaim all personalities.

It is rather remarkable that "Presbyter" and myself, arguing from different standpoints, should arrive at similar conclusions. And this was irrespective of the knowledge that either was writing. This is, I take it, something more than a coincidence.

Canon Moore dismisses my letter very summarily, and leaves me very little to say in reply. I shall say that little, and I fear—perhaps hope—he will not be able to take the sting out of it.

Canon Moore presumes that he cannot, "in the face of Mr. Sandlands's strictures" speak as a "divine who knows his terminology." These are not my words. I quote them simply to introduce the word CONVERSION. Canon Moore has used this word, as I take it, to cover an idea which it does not generally suggest. I fail to find any authority for his proceeding anywhere—either in Scripture or in the Articles and Formularies of the Church. So far as I am able to see, the idea is a novel one.

Now, as I need not say, it is not an easy thing to prove a negation. If Canon Moore finds CONVERSION used anywhere authoritatively in the sense in which he has used it, nothing is easier than to name the authorities. We shall then be able to judge for ourselves. Will Canon Moore kindly do this? The labour of it will not be great.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, Thrapston,
March 24th, 1888.

"BANNS," ETC.

SIR,—May I ask you to correct two sentences in my letter on "Banns," misprinted *through my abominable writing*.

In par. 3. "This passage is the Anglican doctrine expressed," etc.:—this should be "This," he says, etc.

And the end of the same paragraph, where you have "the absurd cry of tattlers of appearances," it should be, "the absurdity of talking of appearances."

This correction will make sense of a sentence quite beyond comprehension.

AN AFFLICTED RELATIVE.

BISHOP ANDREWES ON *CADAVER*.

SIR,—Many talk of Bishop Andrewes who know nothing about his views. Dr. Vogan says, "Dr. Pusey appeals to Bishop Andrewes as his master in Eucharistic doctrine. But he must have overlooked such passages as the following: 'Christ, how or when? Not every way, nor at every time, considered; but as, and when, He was offered up,' *immolatus*, offered up as a sacrifice." "Bishop Andrewes, Sermon 7, on the Resurrection. (Ang. Cath. Theol., ii. 291.)

"Oblatus: so He may be, and yet alive; but the word is, *ἐρίθθ*, *immolatus*, 'offered,' and 'offered in sacrifice.' A live lamb is not it. It is a lamb slain must be our Passover" (*Ibid.* 296).

"*Epulemur* doth here refer to *immolatus* (1 Cor. v. 8.) To Christ, not every way considered, but as when he was offered. Christ's body that now is. True: but not Christ's body as it now is, but as it then was, when it was offered, rent and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not as He now is, glorified, for so He is not, so He cannot be, *immolatus*, for He is

immortal and impassible. But as then He was when He suffered death, that is passible and mortal. Then, in His passible state, did He institute this (feast) of ours, to be a memorial of His passible and passio both. And we are, in this action, not only carried up to Christ (*sursum corda*) but we are also carried back to Christ, as He was, at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering. So, and no otherwise, doth this text teach. So, and no otherwise, do we represent Him. By the incomprehensible power of His Eternal spirit, not He alone, but He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefit of it. If an Host could be turned into Him, now glorified as He is, it would not serve. Christ offered is it, thither we must look. To the serpent lifted up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver*; we must *hoc facere* do that is then done. So, and no otherwise, is this *epulari* to be conceived" (pp. 302, 303).

Dr. Vogan adds, "I must refer the reader to other parts of this work for more authorities to the same purport. But I will here add from the Homilies: 'this table is not (saith Chrysostom) for chattering jays, but for eagles, who fly thither where the *dead* body lieth.' (Homily concerning the Sacrament;" Vogan, p. 104.)

Dr. Vogan quotes Justin Martyr, "the flesh, over which thanksgiving has been made, by the prayer of the word, which is from Him (from which food our flesh and blood are by transmutation nourished), is the Flesh and Blood of Him, the incarnate Jesus." The flesh of a living body, adds Dr. V., could not be intended. The Holy Scriptures never speak of the flesh of sacrifice being eaten, before it is killed; and St. Augustine teaches that to eat the flesh of a living body would be a heinous wickedness or crime." *

St. Gregory of Nyssa also says, that "it is plain to every one that a sheep would not be eaten by man unless it were first killed for food. He therefore who gave His Body for food to His disciples, clearly sheweth, under the form of a Lamb, that the sacrifice was perfected. For the body of the victim would not have been fit for food if it had been alive. When, therefore he gave His Body for food, and His Blood for drink to His disciples, He had already, after an unspeakable and invisible manner, in will, sacrificed His Body by His power as Dispenser of the Mysteries." Theophylact also says, that no one eats "any body unless it be first killed." †

I must stop, but whoever will see the whole subject, must read Dr. Vogan.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE INCARNATION.

SIR,—Mr. Lawrence has not shaken Mr. Bassett in the least. Gordon's Palestine is quoted in vain to show that the Holy Ghost's dwelling in us is tantamount to our Lord's taking man's nature and making it His own. It is useless thus to play on the word "Incarnation." A liquid is poured into a vessel. Is that the same as the substance of the vessel becoming

part of this liquid? I say it *is* absurd, the idea that the Body of our Lord Christ descended from heaven. It is more than absurd. It is false, contrary to Scripture, and heretical. Whether Mr. Lawrence knew of Smalcus before, is nothing to the point, except that it should have been a warning to him.

INQUIRENS.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." March, 1888. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

PROFESSOR BRUCE begins a series of papers on the Epistle to the Hebrews. He holds, with Bleek and the majority of the ancients, that the Hebrews to whom the Epistle was first addressed were resident in Palestine, or, more definitely, in Jerusalem. He decides against the Pauline authorship, which he describes as "destitute of all probability." This is far too strong a statement. If St. Paul did write it, then "he performed a service which he had not had leisure or occasion to render in any other epistle." Why should he not?

Professor Davidson thinks that literal locusts are referred to by the prophet Joel. Probably; but surely Joel must have seen something else behind the locusts, otherwise his description of the calamity is exaggerated; infinitely worse things can happen to a nation than famine of bread;—there would be a want of spirituality about the whole prophecy if this were all.

But over and over again the best paper in the number is Mr. Taylor Innes' on II. (IV.) Esdras. He calls it "A Forgotten Poet," and he is right. Esdras was a poet, and he is forgotten. How few people read the Apocrypha, and how foolish is their neglect! We have made a note of Mr. Innes' paper, and hope our readers will do the same.

Dr. Wright has but a poor opinion of the commentators on the Pentateuch and Joshua; to make up for it, the editor much overrates "The Revolution in Tanner's Lane." The commentators are not quite so feeble as Dr. Wright thinks, nor the "Revolution in Tanner's Lane" so able as the editor thinks.

"THOUGHTS FOR CHURCH SEASONS." By Rev. Daniel Moore, M.A. London: Nisbet & Co.

THIS volume contains 319 pages, well and clearly printed, and the 319 pages comprise forty-five sermons; it is obvious, therefore, that the sermons are short. And of these forty-five sermons four are for Advent, six for Christmas, ten for Lent, six for Holy Week, five for Easter, four for Ascensiontide, eight for Whitsuntide, and only two for Trinity—a period, we suppose, when preachers may select subjects at their own discretion or indiscretion.

The sermons—Mr. Moore calls them "papers" in his preface—are intended for "invalids" and others "wont to combine an exercise of sacred meditations with their office of daily devotion." We suppose this means that the book is intended for Mr. Matthew Arnold's friend, the "plain man," who, besides saying his prayers, likes to read a sermon now and then. And quite right too, only Mr. Moore need not have used such painfully professional language to express a very simple meaning.

* "Facinus vel flagitium videtur (John vi. 53) jubere: figura est ergo." Thus he speaks of a human body, and therefore he would have said worse of eating a living human body. De Doct. Christ. iii. 16.

† Comm. in St. Matthew, c. xxviii. Disc. ii. p. 95, 1826,

The sermons contain rather too many long words, and very few ideas not commonplace; but they are earnest and good, though certainly not great.

“THE POWER OF THE CHURCH IN THE WORLD.”

An Address delivered in Trinity College, Dublin, to the Theological Society, on November 14th, 1887, by the Author, the Rev. T. Vevers Morley (Sch.), B.A., Curate of All Saints', Grangegorman. Pp. 49. 1887. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.

THIS is a young man's production, and therefore not to be too strictly criticised. It does his industry in collecting quotations a great deal of credit. Of course it has nothing new except a little, which requires to be carefully examined.

At p. 12 we read, “As, by contact with Adam's fallen nature we are born to death, so, by contact with the divine humanity of Christ, we are born again to life eternal.” What contact we have in baptism with our Lord's humanity, our writer does not explain. All we know is that He embraces us with the arms of His mercy, and adopts us into the family of God, through the Holy Spirit. At p. 47 the writer says, “We have considered the work of the Incarnation and its development in the Church, where it is communicated by the Sacraments.” This again is vague, referring as well to baptism, as to the Holy Eucharist. But in the preceding page, 46, we have something more definite, implying actual contact with our Lord's Body, as if locally and substantially in the elements. “Hence we can understand the full significance of the warning words, etc., on the Resurrection morning: ‘Touch me not for I am not yet ascended,’ implying that, after the Ascension, such a touch would be permissible, as it really is in the Church, and, in the highest degree, in the greatest of the Sacraments, the Holy Eucharist.” This seems to favour the theory that “the ninety places at once is fairly based on Scripture, to be adored, and that our Lord's Body is not bound by the limits which condition a material clod.” All this is plainly contrary to the 4th and 15th Articles, and also to the Black Rubric, which, still, we all have to sign as if we agreed with them. And yet we read, p. 13, “During the great forty days previous to His Ascension, and again for the ten days until the day of Pentecost was come, there was no manifestation. The Lord was absent—there was a void.” Certainly the Holy Ghost was not yet come, but, as our Lord appeared to them continually, it seems hard to say that “there was a void,” more than before His death. Does “there was a void” mean that His Body was not present spiritually in the Eucharist? How do we know that the Eucharist was not celebrated during the interval? In fact we know nothing about it: and our young guide was only drawing on his own imagination, after the poetic and most dangerous manner of the Fathers and Mediæval writers. There is a great deal of pretension in this, and such like performances. “Some things are new and some things are true,” and we know the rest of the saying. The acclamations with which essays are received, and the too-kind approval of superiors, are calculated to turn a young man's brain, and to make him think himself a genius, when he is only repeating exploded theories of the middle ages, which, like the fly in the ointment, tend to corrupt what would be otherwise true, though commonplace. If essays on such difficult subjects are to be read before the Pro-

fessors, and, as a matter of course, receive their sanction, they ought certainly to be previously submitted for their censure and correction. It is too bad that such crude notions should come forth and be printed with the seeming approval of the heads of our Divinity school. There is really much the same doctrine in a sermon lately preached in Dublin by a Popish American Bishop.

THE east window of Trinity Church, Margate, has been filled with glass from the studio of Mr. Taylor, of Berners Street, the gift of various donors.

THE death is announced of the Rev. Horatio Nelson Ward, who was for thirty-five years rector of Radstock, Somerset. He was the son of the Rev. Philip Ward, of Tenterden, Kent; his mother being the “little Horatia” whom Lord Nelson at his death bequeathed to the care of the nation. When she grew up she was married to Mr. Ward, and the gentleman now deceased was her eldest son. He was educated at Pembroke, and took his Bachelor's degree in 1847. In the following year he was ordained, and in 1853 was presented to Radstock, by the late Lady Waldegrave.

THE *Church Review* announces the sudden death, on Sunday week, of another well-known layman, Mr. Albert Harford Pearson. Mr. Pearson, says the *Review*, who was in the forty-ninth year of his age, was educated at New College, Oxford, and gained a Third Class in the School of History, Easter Term, 1863. He was a son of the late Rev. C. B. Pearson, rector of Knebworth, and prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral. It was doubtless his connection with that venerable fane which made him take a deep interest in everything connected with the Sarum rite, and he translated many of the sequences which appear in his son's translation of the Sarum Missal. That work was originally published anonymously, though it was an open secret that Mr. A. H. Pearson was the translator; and when a second edition was called for some four years ago his name appeared on the title-page. Mr. Pearson had been called to the bar, but he will be remembered by his painstaking and scholarly version of the most illustrious Liturgy of the Church of England. The book, in spite of its necessarily high price, has had a marvellous sale, and one which has been continuous as years went on. The criticisms of it which have appeared cordially recognise the value of Mr. Pearson's scholarship and the beauty of the renderings into English of the wonderful set of sequences which places the Sarum Missal on a pinnacle by itself among the Liturgies of Christendom—the Roman Missal, for instance, having only four sequences throughout the whole year. In addition to this *opus vite sue*, Mr. Pearson also issued a volume of prayers and offices for use at funerals, published by the Church Printing Company under the title of “Burial Offices according to the English Uses.”

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro*, of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C. will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

THE Rev. John Henry Sapte, Hon. Canon of Winchester and Rector of Cranleigh, has been appointed Archdeacon of Surrey, in the room of the Ven. P. R. Atkinson, deceased.

ON Saturday Bishop Scott, of North China, left to attend the Lambeth Conference, and may be expected to land before June.

ON Friday the Bishop of Shrewsbury (Sir L. Stamer) was presented with an illuminated address by the clergy and churchwardens of the archdeaconry of Stoke on his consecration, the subscribers to the address representing no fewer than 114 parishes.

ON Wednesday, the 21st inst., Dr. Danford Thomas held an inquest on the body of Mrs. Margaret Bell Galloway, aged seventy, wife of the vicar of St. Mark's, Regent's Park. Mr. Galloway, junior, said that on Monday he heard the deceased exclaim, "Oh, oh!" as though she was suffering pain, and on hurrying out of the room saw her lying insensible on the hall floor. She had apparently fallen over the banisters while ascending the stairs. She was subject to giddiness. Although occasionally depressed, he had no reason to think she had contemplated suicide. She had fallen a distance of about thirty feet, breaking a gas-pipe bracket in the course of her descent, and had fractured her skull. The jury returned a verdict of accidental death.

ON Monday last the Rev. C. W. King, Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, died in London. His friends had noticed that he seemed much feebler than usual during last term, and he suffered a little from hoarseness, but no one could anticipate that he was so near the end. He took his degree as Junior Optime and Sixth Classic in 1840, the same year as the Bishop of Hereford and the Bishop of Carlisle, and since that time he devoted himself to archaeology as a serious study, with all the patience and care of a thorough scholar. His knowledge was extraordinarily wide and accurate, and as an authority on gems he had no rival. He was able to throw a flood of fresh light upon the character and affinities of various Gnostic systems by the study of their remains. The recently published edition of his book contained the results of later researches, but his eyesight had so far failed that he was unable to revise the sheets himself. His life for some years past had been very retired, but he was most generously willing to give all the aid in his power to the younger students, and his death is an irreparable loss.

ON Friday, says the *Yorshire Post*, it was reported that the Crown had agreed to the appointment of a Bishop Suffragan for Ripon diocese. The wealthy living of Stanhope, in the county of Durham, is in the patronage of the Bishop of Ripon, and that living being now vacant, opportunity is thus afforded of making the appointment of Suffragan, the plan having also the approval of those who know best the circumstances of the diocese. With the help of a Suffragan resident in the north, and the creation of the new see of Wakefield, more time will be at the disposal of the Bishop of Ripon for the important work in the large towns of his diocese:—"It is stated that the newly appointed Suffragan will be the Rev. J. J. Pulleine, M.A., rector of Kirby Wiske, and Canon of Ripon. This appointment, if made, will be well received wherever Mr. Pulleine is known. He has approved himself so completely by his earnestness and in-

dustry, and is so fit from his long experience and local knowledge, that he will be heartily welcomed as a Yorkshireman by Yorkshiremen, and as a good man by men of all shades of opinion. It is understood that it is not yet decided by what title the new Suffragan will be known. Canon John James Pulleine was appointed rector of Kirkby Wiske in 1868. Previous to his appointment he had been a Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, taking the degree of B.A. (Second Class Classical Tripos) in 1865, and M.A. 1868, being ordained deacon in 1866, and priest (Salisbury) in the following year. The rev. gentleman was made Honorary Canon of Ripon in 1882, and received the appointment of examining chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon last year. He had been assistant-master of Marlborough College 1865-68, curate of St. Giles-in-the-Fields 1868, organising secretary to the Ripon Diocesan Societies 1876-83, and chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon from 1877 to 1884."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Bourne, Rev. A. E., Vicar of All Saints', Battersea; Vicar of Burham, Kent.
 Cooke, Rev. Arthur Henry, B.A., Assistant-Curate of Sutton-on-Plym; Rector of Trevalyn, Cornwall.
 Cubison, Rev. Walter Charles Goldsmith, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrews', Lower Streatham.
 Evans, Rev. Henry Cotterell, M.A., Vicar of Shalbourne, Berks.
 Farbrother, Rev. Frederick R., M.A., Vicar of Winkle, Maeclesfield; Vicar of Smallthorne, Stoke-on-Trent.
 Fawkes, Rev. T. R. J., Vicar of Dawley Magna, Salop.
 Garland, Rev. T. B., M.A., Vicar of Bishopswood, Staffordshire.
 Holden, Rev. Joseph, Curate of Ravensthorpe; Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society for Bristol.
 Melville, Rev. David M., Senior Curate of St. Peter's, and Chaplain of the Workhouse, Leicester; Chaplain of the Workhouse and Infirmary, Kensington.
 Parker, Rev. James Benjamin, M.A., Curate of Beckenham; Rector of St. Andrew's, Deal.
 Ponsonby, Rev. Stuart Gordon, Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter.
 Roberts, Rev. Arthur Courtenay, Vicar of Great Dunmow; Rural Dean of Dunmow.
 Sapte, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Rector of Cranleigh; Archdeacon of Surrey.
 Young, Rev. C. Gordon, Curate of St. Jude's, Kensal Green; Chaplain to the New St. Marylebone Infirmary, Notting Hill.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Baumont, Rev. J. A., formerly Incumbent of St. Paul's, Leeds and Rector of Poughill, at Weldon House, Leamington Spa, on the 21st inst., aged 68.
 Heath, Rev. Richard Ford, Vicar of Bishopswood, formerly of Tottenham, at Bideford, on the 11th inst., aged 55.
 Ireland, Rev. William Milton, of Robertstown, County Kildare, and Vicar of Whaddon, Cambridgeshire, at Beaconsfield House, Tunbridge Wells, on the 23rd inst.
 Maude, Rev. C. W., at Great Munden Rectory, Ware, on the 22nd inst., aged 71.
 Oxenham, Rev. Henry Nutcombe, at 42, Addison Road, Kensington, after a short illness, on the 23rd inst., aged 58.
 Russell, Rev. Alexander Benn, B.C.L., Rector of Lavington, Bath, at Clevedon, on the 23rd inst., in his 85th year.
 Starey, Rev. Augustin, M.A., Vicar of Charing, Ashford, Kent, at Bath, on the 23rd inst., aged 38.
 Wells, Rev. Francis Ballard, for forty-seven years Rector of Woodchurch, at Woodchurch Rectory, on the 21st inst., aged 76.



The Church of England Pulpit.

NARROWNESS.

BY THE VERY REV. HERBERT ARMITAGE
JAMES, B.D., DEAN OF ST. ASAPH.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD, ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 12TH, 1888.

"When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."—1 COR. xiii. 10.

THERE are two shades of meaning in which St. Paul uses the word *τέλειος*, here translated "perfect." Most commonly he employs it to denote what is full grown as opposed to what is undeveloped, what is manly as opposed to what is childish. Here, however, that is not quite the idea; it implies rather what is complete as distinguished from what is partial, what is comprehensive as distinguished from what is narrow or one-sided. In both senses it expresses, though from slightly different sides, the Christian ideal of humanity. For as the Christian, if he is to rise to the loftiest conception of his profession, cannot be a child, cannot always be content with the beggarly elements of the faith, but must go on unto full growth; so also there must be a completeness about him, a due proportion in his nature. Not only must there be a growth of the man as a whole, but the parts of him, like the organs in the body, must grow side by side and proportionately. That which is abnormally developed on one side and stunted on another is not "perfect." And Christianity, however earnest, however zealous, is not perfect if it is narrow or partial.

Now everything human is in a greater or less degree narrow or partial. Men are bounded, necessarily bounded, by their circumstances: by the ideas of their nation, the ideas of their age, the ideas of the social class of which they are members, the school of thought in which they have been educated, the religious body to which they belong. And these limitations fetter the growth, detract from the perfection of their nature, not only as men but as Christians. It is, therefore, one of the first tasks which Christianity must set before itself, to cast itself loose from the bonds which fetter it, to deliver men from the dominion of one-sided views of life.

If you will look at Christ's work in the world—I mean the actual work which He did in His lifetime—you will see how much of it is concerned with this conflict of comprehensiveness with narrowness, of perfection with partiality. What He

found in His way, in the way of the acceptance of the great principles of the Gospel, was not so much wickedness as prejudice, not so much immorality as one-sided views of morality. It was of little use converting sinners from the error of their way, if, by converting them, He only turned them from Publicans into Pharisees. And so His task was to battle with the national narrowness which saw in the Jews an ideal people, with the narrowness of the age which thought its own civilisation a perfect one, with the narrowness of the Pharisee to whom his own views of religion were final. Until these false standards, these puny and mistaken ideals, were dethroned, and something higher and nobler and more perfect put in their place, it was vain to drive out the unclean spirit of iniquity and sin, and to sweep and garnish the heart where it had made its abode; that could only end in its coming back with seven other spirits more wicked than itself, and the last state would be worse than the first. If mankind was to be saved from sin, it would not be by the old fashioned conventional righteousness of the Scribes and the Rabbis, but by a complete and deeply-rooted change; not by making Gentiles into Jews by circumcision; not by urging men to fulfil the law of God by a closer attention to fringes, and Sabbaths, and washing of cups and platters. What was wanted was a new creature, and before this change could take place there must be a clean sweep made of these one-sided ideas, these purely Jewish conceptions, these Pharisaic nostrums. They must get outside the circle in which these moved, into a freer and truer atmosphere, where God could speak to man as man: where repentance and obedience and faith and trust took the place of formal sacrifices and stated services and traditional legalities. What Christ brought to the world was a spiritual emancipation; in other words He put a universal religion in the place of a provincial one.

And that battle, fought in that way and against those foes nineteen hundred years ago in Palestine, has to be fought afresh continually in new ways and against new foes in every generation and every land—the battle of what is complete and perfect and full-grown and broad in man, against what is partial and imperfect and crude and narrow. Christianity sets before us a complete humanity as the standard at which we are to aim; a humanity in which every part of us has been allowed to grow and develop; in which, though one part may attain a higher perfection than another, yet none is stunted or undeveloped. Mentally, morally, spiritually, it demands of us the culture of all our powers, of all the different sides of our nature.

I say mentally, for it is quite untrue that Christianity has nothing to do with mental culture. The cultivation of the intellect on all its sides is of the last importance to a right view of religion. For

what is Christianity? It is not one thing, but half-a-score of things. It is a science—the science of God built up upon the facts of revelation and of nature. It is a philosophy—a system of morality based upon the relations of man to God. It is a history—the story of these relations as they worked themselves out along the course of the ages. It is a poem, speaking to the spiritual imagination in man of things that pass his understanding. It is a practical rule of life, appealing to his common sense, and meant to help him in the every-day actions of his ordinary passage through the world. It is all these things from different points of view; and just in proportion to the absence of culture in this or that power of our minds is the probability that we shall misjudge Christianity; above all, if we are only capable of looking at it on one of its sides to the exclusion of the rest, it is a very faint conception of its reality that we shall have at all. It is a common accusation of scientific men against Christianity that Christians come to science with theological methods, and full of theological ideas and pre-conceptions; that they fail to realise its point of view or to understand either its methods or the bearing of its results. The historian complains of their contempt of historical methods: the philosopher of illogical arguments. And no doubt there is a sense in which the argument is true. But there is another side to the matter. There is a scientific spirit also which shuts its eyes to everything else but the results of science, which peremptorily rejects Christianity because it cannot reconcile the facts of geology or of evolution with the text of Genesis. There is a historic spirit which proclaims it a detected imposture, because it is unable to make the chronology of the Bible fit in with the facts of history. There is a philosophic spirit which points out triumphantly how the morality of Christianity fails to satisfy utilitarian standards. Each man comes to it with his own measuring-rod, and pronounces it wanting: each with his own Shibboleth, and condemns it because the accent is a little foreign. It is approached just as some old English drama is approached by its critics; where one counts the feminine endings of the lines, another hunts for anachronisms of grammar, a third for the proofs of the writer's acquaintance, or want of acquaintance, with this or that source of knowledge; and between them they are a little apt to forget the glorious sweep of the rhythm, the inspired nobility of the thought, which proclaim it Shakespeare's. So it is with the criticism of Christianity. This incapacity for seeing the various sides of religion, and how one modifies and runs into another, this carping at details oblivious of the whole, is partly due to men's natural bias, the special character of their minds. When one so conspicuously fair-minded, and so singularly able as Darwin, tells us that the only part of his school or University education

which was of any use to him was the Paley which he had to read at Cambridge, we see how difficult it is for a mind with a strong natural bent in one direction to see any importance in what to another mind with another bent are the most interesting sides of the many problems of life. It is one of the dangers of our modern tendency to specialisation in education and study and research that it helps to emphasise this difficulty and increase it. What we want is not less specialisation, not less cultivation of the predominant faculty of each individual mind (for anything is better than a dead level of intellect, a colourless waste of humanity), but a wider outlook, a more liberal recognition of the many aspects of life and truth, a refusal to stunt our powers on one side in order to develop them on another. Above all, in the case of ordinary minds, we need, and strongly need, an education, a training, an awakening of interest in something higher than the life of every day. A dull routine of learning—the arithmetic and grammar of our childhood, the snattering of dead or modern languages, the dry bones of history or of philosophy of our youth, find their natural outcome in the commerce and money-making, the athletics and sport, the eating and drinking, the round of soulless pleasure and social duties, of our later life. Much of the incapacity for religious feeling, for appreciating all that Christianity is or should be to us, is an intellectual incapacity. Our reason is not convinced, because the eyes of our soul have never been opened, or trained to see.

There are few institutions in the world that have the opportunities of a University for imparting this breadth of culture, for developing the many sides of intellectual power. But how far it can succeed in doing this must lie not only with the teachers but the taught: not only with the University but with its sons. It is not enough that the University should be true to its name, and offer varied outlets for minds of varied powers; that will but end in narrowness, if each chooses his special study and then never steps outside the groove of it. But it is less in the set studies of the University than in its many-coloured life, in the meeting of men bred up in every shade of social, and intellectual, and religious surroundings, that Oxford does its true work, that it teaches a real culture, and imparts a real breadth to the minds which are entrusted to it to shape. It is not for nothing that the University system sets a value not only upon the mere results of reading, but upon the common life of the place. And those who come here, and neglect their opportunities of this higher intercourse of mind with mind, who bury themselves in their books, and never use the living channels of mental enlightenment in the varied minds about them, and those, on the other hand, to whom such higher intercourse is unknown, whose perpetual talk is of the life of pleasure and of sense, of athletics and competitions, are blind

to the glorious opportunity which is theirs to-day, and to-morrow will have vanished.

It is in the communion of mind with mind, in the new lights that flash upon us and give us fresh insight born of this communion, that young minds at least can best prepare themselves to face those solemn problems of life which sooner or later, in greater or less degree, confront us all—problems of the life here and of the life hereafter.

Turn from the intellectual side of the question to its moral side. The ordinary morality of the world—even of the better part of it—is as narrow and as one-sided as its intellectual interests; and the same phenomena meet us in one sphere as in the other. There is the same abnormal development of certain sides of human nature, the same stunting, the same atrophy, of others. The Christian code says that "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." The morality of the world exactly reverses that: it holds that whoever keeps the law in one point may be excused all the rest. It is a world of pet virtues; every age, every stage of civilisation, boasts one which is all in all; now it is courage, now it is chastity, now it is truthfulness, now it is honesty; but, whatever it is, there is one which eclipses the rest, and makes men forget them. Classes and religions have their special virtues, and the virtue of one is the vice of another: the obedience which to the soldier or the monk is the first of duties, is the contempt of the democrat and the champion of freedom. What freehandedness and daring are to youth, that thrift and caution are to age. The chastity which in a woman is the first and great commandment, barely finds a place at the end of the male decalogue. The drunkenness which is condemned in the poor is winked at in the rich, or else, in a burst of well-meant fanaticism, temperance, the one virtue which, in its modern signification, is not a mean between the two extremes but an extreme out of relation to any mean, is exalted as the goal of all moral aspirations. And, looking to the other side, there are lofty virtues which a man may absolutely ignore and leave out of his account, and yet be as respectable as ever. How many people in the world recognise the duty of generosity? I don't mean the pauperising of the world by indiscriminate alms-giving, but the making of some sacrifice perceptible to themselves, to further some great cause, the triumph of which will bring them no gratitude, but will help to reform and raise mankind. What proportion of men own the duty of spending a definite proportion of what they earn or have inherited, upon something that is not themselves, and that does not minister directly or indirectly to their comfort, or luxury, or pleasure? The great charitable societies can answer that question. They know that the gifts of the nation are the gifts of the few, and that when some terrible disaster, some pitiful distress, is supposed to have moved England

to its very heart, it is only the small self-sacrificing class that sacrifices more, and that the great selfish multitude is as little touched by it as the depths of the ocean by the winds that ruffle its surface. There is something hideous in the blank dull selfishness of the comfortable classes. See how it is reflected everywhere. In one of the leading reviews this month there is an article on how to live on £700 a year. Every item of expenditure is carefully examined and canvassed: a pound or two may be saved here, and another pound or two there. You must smoke cigarettes instead of cigars, ride in an omnibus instead of a cab, be content with a cheaper seat at the theatre. What for? That you may have something to give to relief of necessity, to the spread of Christianity, to the mitigation of pain, to the raising of mankind? No, but that you may live comfortably, and keep up appearances. There are six pages of the stuff: and when at the end of the article the writer has triumphantly proved his point, and shown, by carefully tabulated statistics, that some one actually accomplished the difficult feat with £50 to spare at the end of the year, he saves his conscience by the pious sentiment, coming like grace after meat at a City banquet, that "it must not be forgotten that a certain portion of every income should be spent in assisting our poorer neighbours in their hard battle with want." What a distance it is from this to Francis of Assisi, or John Howard, or Shaftesbury! No wonder that we are sometimes told that Christian ideals are too few, and too far out of the reach of ordinary people to be of any practical use in popularising Christianity. We don't believe in them. We shut our eyes to them in life, reading them, when they do meet us, with the eyes of our own low vision, and asking whether these men serve God for nought. When they come across us in books we ridicule them as impossible creations. "The loudest demand of the present day," it has been said, "is for the representation of that grade of humanity of which men see the most—that type of things which could never have been but that it might pass. The demand marks the commonness, narrowness low-levelled satisfaction of the age. It loves its own—not that which might be and ought to be its own—not its better self, infinitely higher than its present—for the sake of which it exists. In our day, a man who will accept any oddity of idiosyncratic development in manners, tastes, or habits, will refuse not only as improbable, but as inconsistent with human nature, the representation of a man trying to be merely as noble as is absolutely essential to his being—except indeed he be at the same time represented as failing utterly in the attempt. Its improbability, judged by the experience of most men, I admit. Its unreality in fact I deny. And its absolute unity with the true idea of humanity, I believe and assert." Those are true words; the ideals are there if we will look for

them and believe in them. They are not only conceivable in the imagination, but present in the life. Above all, there is one Ideal, once incarnate in this our flesh, even now visible and tangible to the faithful soul, who is set up as an example for us to follow, in whom all truth and goodness and longsuffering and purity dwelt bodily, so blent and attuned that all men marvelled at that gracious soul, at the beauty of that stainless life. To believe in Jesus Christ, to make Him our pattern and ideal, to follow out His example in our lives, is to hasten the day for ourselves at least "when that which is perfect shall come."

With that thought let me pass to the narrowness and one-sidedness of our spiritual or religious life. To do so is to open one of the saddest and most melancholy pages of human history; to begin the story of the bigotries and persecutions which have brought it about that that sentence of the old heathen once spoken in genuine wonder and delight is now too often repeated as the bitterest of ironies, "See how these Christians love one another." But what is the cause of all this narrow exclusiveness and these internecine feuds? Don't make the mistake of putting them down to what is sometimes called the theological spirit. The history alike of ancient empires and modern democracies teaches us with a voice that cannot be misunderstood, that if it be more shameful for Christians to persecute unbelievers, it is at least as congenial (even in the days of an advanced civilisation) to unbelievers to persecute Christians. And, again, don't make the mistake of believing that a strong faith, an irresistible conviction, of the truth of any creed, religious or anti-religious, has any necessary connexion with bigotry or persecution. Some of the most unquestioning, uncompromising faiths in the world have been found side by side with gentle tolerant natures that yearned far more to save the lost than to condemn the transgressor. If that had not been true, Christian missions would have been an impossibility; but thank God, St. Paul, with a tolerance as large as his faith was unshaken, has been the type which Christian missionaries have followed ever since the day when he won the world to his Master. Never dream that to be tolerant you must be hazy about your creed. Then what is the secret of Christian intolerance? It is simply that men in embracing Christianity have only embraced one side of it. I said just now that Christianity had many sides; that it was a science, a philosophy, a history, a poem, a rule of life. I am far from saying that to be a true believer in Christ you must necessarily realise to the full all these aspects of your religion. True it is that many a peasant has been a trained theologian in no restricted sense; true it is that many a man whose only university has been a Sunday School, whose only library his Bible, has known the history of God's people better than you or I have ever known it;

true it is that many a simple mind, whose every day cares took it no higher than the quest for daily food and domestic comforts, has found its poetry in the thought of God, its lyrics in the Psalms, its epic in the Gospels; but all this is not a necessary result of Christianity—it is and must be the exception, not the rule. But when that is said it remains true that there are two great aspects of Christianity, neither of which can be overlooked without fatal consequences to humanity. In a word, Christianity is at once a creed and a life. You cannot forget either of these aspects of it without narrowing your religion indefinitely. Men have lived the saintliest of lives, and realising the utter beauty of saintliness, have thrown creeds to the winds; but they have injured the unity and cohesion and force of the army of Christ, and in sapping the faith they have sapped the morality of those who adopted their dislike for formulas without striving to copy their holiness. And on the other hand it is a commoner experience still that a man cannot be a perfect Christian who thinks of Christianity as a creed only, and not also as a life and a following of Christ. To be a Christian in mind only and not in heart is a meagre Christianity indeed. And yet it is one of the very commonest forms of Christianity; it is a form so easy either to realise or to assume. No need to go to the history of persecution for your proof; you probably can find on your own staircase a man whose orthodoxy is much less questionable than his daily life. Or again, take another side of the same defect. To too many students of Christianity (it has been strikingly said lately) religion has changed into the religious difficulty; it has become a controversy. O that men would realise the truth that religion is not and cannot be a thing of the mind alone: that the presence of Christ in our life is of the heart and the essence of it! What a peace such a conviction really driven home to us would bring to our theological feuds! I for one cannot conceive how men could dispute about the Communion of Christ's Body and Blood, how they could bandy to and fro their cries of irreverence on the one hand and superstition on the other, if they lived literally and daily under the shadow of the cross, if they saw uplifted above them the dying form of Him who was crucified that they might be like Him. And how many of those to whom religion now is only a church-going once and again, only a fit of repentance now and then in the hour of sorrow or danger or humiliation, would stand aloof from that Holy Sacrament of our Brotherhood and Allegiance, if they could realise the need for the two things which there meet and are fused: belief—the belief in the death it commemorates; and life—the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies, to Him? Go on then to a fuller growth and a more perfect stature, buying up the opportunities which your own life here or elsewhere brings you in such profusion. Open

your hearts to new truth, to new light, to new incomings of the Spirit of Christ, to new views of His cross.

Even so may He, present in His sacrament, or in the communion of our prayers, or in the journey of our daily life, bring us ever nearer to Himself, cast out all that hinders, give breadth to what is narrow, develop what is stunted, fructify what is barren, stablish, strengthen, and make us perfect, even as our Father in heaven also is perfect.

ANYTHING BUT THE ONE THING.

BY THE REV. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A.,
CHAPLAIN AT GOTHENBURG.

SERMON PREACHED AT GOTHENBURG, ON SUNDAY,
MARCH 4TH, 1888.

“And when he heard him he did many things, and heard him gladly.”—ST. MARK vi. 20.

YES! Herod heard John gladly, and yet John did not please Herod. Nor did Herod please John, for he did many things, but not the one thing; he heard him and took pleasure in hearing him, though John's sermon was always on one text and had but one point in it: “Put away that woman with whom you are living in adultery.” The reason Herod found pleasure in listening to John was this, that he had not the slightest intention of parting with either his sin or his temptation, and the stern preacher's words of warning just titillated a worn and jaded conscience sufficiently to enable him to persuade himself that his was not such a bad and hopeless case after all, forasmuch as he felt the greatest respect for the prophet, and acknowledged that he was a good and pious man. Yes! and more than this; since John had begun to preach at the court, Herod had reformed many an evil; the cups and the platters of their licentious life were scourged—on the outside. The sepulchre of vice wherein they had buried deep and dead their souls and hearts, now received a new coat of whitewash. Respectability began, one can imagine, to grow more the order of the day again, and Herod's soul showed signs of stirring in his dried and seared heart. But the reform was no more than skin deep, for all this time Herod's mistress held unchecked sway, and Herod's sin was the one thing that remained undisturbed. God came, and by the mouth of His prophet asked the sceptical Herod for the surrender of the idol of his heart; the answer was that he would repair and repatch the temple where the idol was enthroned! God bade him repent! He replied by becoming the patron and protector (for that is the meaning of the word translated, “observed” him), of the man who brought the summons.

See now what this means. Here was a man who professed the atheistic doctrine of the times

and sang with the boldest, “Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die,” yet, for the life of him, he could not shake off the need of religious truth—he sends for John and hears his magnificent declaration of the demands of the King of kings; he heard and heeded but obeyed not. He was of the school of philosophy which denied that the soul of man could live without the body, or that there is any resurrection, neither angel nor spirit; yet superstition reigns so supreme within his disordered brain that, on hearing of the works of another just and holy man also preaching a kingdom of Heaven, his conscience immediately gives the lie to his life and his philosophy and his false ease of luxury: “this is none other,” he cries, “than John whom I beheaded; he is risen from the dead.”

But now let us fix our minds earnestly on this special point in the career of the one man to whom our Lord applied the only word of pure contempt in the Gospels. He warns and rebukes many, he calls the religious and orthodox Pharisees and the worldly and cold Sadducees by names which convey the sting of scorn with the rebuke of warning—hypocrites, play-actors, vipers, whited sepulchres—but Herod Antipas, in contempt of his effeminate luxury, his degraded viciousness, his low cunning, his unbridled passions, he dismissed from his mind with the words, go tell that “she-fox.” “She fox.” For Herod was not only bad but mean, not only mean but cunning. It is a part of the Nemesis of evil-doing that it produces evil thinking. Herod hankered after his brother's wife, and by cunning secured her. He also hankered after an easy conscience, and thought by cunning to secure that too. If he can only bring this terrible prophet to look leniently on him, then he may indeed feel at ease; for John's approval will surely be the guarantee that John's Master will be equally lenient. Hence his attempt to satisfy John with his “many” reforms. Hence his long effort to secure a hearing and a sight of John's successor, the prophet Jesus. Hence his keen satisfaction at the sight of Jesus when sent to him from Pilate. Hence, too, perhaps, the desire to see some miracle wrought by Christ; a desire which only provoked the contemptuous silence of that “meek and lowly” One who yet was sterner in His love than even the Baptist in his wrath.

He is indeed a particularly bad specimen, yet he is, alas, but a specimen, and not an isolated instance of a class of men and women who are always to be found in the company of the preachers of God's Word to men.

And here let me say that I think that the man with a message to deliver, the man who speaks to others of that which God has spoken to him, even if his message must take the form of John's rebuke to Herod, as well as of Christ's “blessings” on the Mount, and His Gospel of love and mercy; if the man has a real word to say, there will always be ears ready to

hear. What we preachers of the Gospel, we ministers of the Church of Christ have to do is to see to it that we do get some word from God, some seed of the tree of life, and sow it broadly.

But, friends, the end of the preaching of God's truth, whether by Christ or by His ministers and prophets is not to be the hearing of eloquent speakers, but the "receiving of the prophet in the name of a prophet." Thus and thus only is the prophet's reward to be won. Not the "hearing gladly," but the pondering deeply will produce that germinating of the seed in the heart which makes the harvest of God plentiful and good. Pray then, friends, pray to the Lord of the harvest that good seed may be sown here in this church, and from this pulpit, plentifully, and that it may fall upon not merely hearing ears, but upon prepared hearts, that so fruit may be reaped unto life eternal. For otherwise of what use can my ministry in this place be—what shall I become but a cumberer of the ground in God's field?

And be this my word to you this morning; a word I pass through my own heart before I dare offer it to you. *God asks us for one great thing; then do not put Him off with many little things.*

During this season of Lent I try specially to guide our Sunday meditations to a scrutiny of our practical everyday life, but let us take care that we do not dissipate our attention, and concern ourselves deeply with the small faults and the details of life, and lose sight of the "one thing needful," the one principle which alone makes these details instinct with life and power.

Let us seek, then, the principles involved in this sadly instructive narrative. Put out of sight the particular surroundings of Herod—the Oriental life, the coarseness of the times, the wildness of social morality, the madness of even a limited despotism, the peculiar and inherited passions of this unhappy man, and then say honestly, if in essence, in the kernel and root of the whole matter, Herod face to face with John the Baptist is not the representative, as I said, of a class of persons commonly to be found near all preaching of the Gospel of Truth. In its essence it is this: Here is a man who had sinned deeply, yet not more deeply than was fashionable, and, in the social estimate of morality, trivial; who is godless, yet not more godless than his neighbours after all; who is sceptical of the truth—the full truth—of the faith of his home and country, and therefore ready to excuse himself from its more pressing obligations; who is not religious enough to fear God, yet is superstitious enough to fear the rebuke of the man who believes God; who hankers after religion, yet will not forsake sin; who would forego much and do much to secure freedom of conscience, yet will not turn his eyes away from the dear vice which bars the door to freedom; who shrinks from the hell he sees possible, though he stoutly denies its existence, who would cling to life, yet will not

enter heaven. Oh, my brothers, is this a fair description of the men and women whose soul-hunger stares at one out of deep eyes in your streets and drawing rooms this very day; or is it only a picture, a fanciful, absurd, and exaggerated picture of that wretched trifler, who in his prime manhood played with religion, and at last died godless and hopeless and outcast, in the little town of Lugdunum 1849 years ago?

Yet Herod heard the word of the kingdom gladly! Gladly, but not well. Better far had he heard it sadly. That gladness, that praise of the preacher, that admiration of his words, may be as the gall and wormwood to him, for he knows that before gladness should come sorrow; instead of delight in his voice should be care for his truth. No! that was an unhealthy ephemeral gladness—like the joyless laugh of the despairing and hopeless. Says St. Paul: "I rejoiced that ye sorrowed." Why! because "ye sorrowed to repentance." It was "sorrow after a godly sort," such as dissolves the cause of the grief in its very tears; or in plain language it grieves not at the result of the sin only, but at the sin itself, and so removes the stumbling-block and lets in the light of God's sunshine again.

The Gospel of Christ Jesus is indeed such a message as to make the heart that hears it rejoice. It speaks to you of hope where no hope was; of peace where the conscience and the soul were torn and bruised with the war of life; of mercy where your eye lights upon faults and sins such as turn the heart sick; of the Blood of Christ the Redeemer, where stern justice tells you that it is your blood that is due as the forfeit of your life; of the love of God, where men show malice and uncharitableness and coldness; of light and sunshine, where the damp mists of doubt and difficulty and heartlessness oppress you. Yes! it is a grand beautiful word, this which we preach in the name of Christ, this declaration of the Gospel of the God of Love. And you "hear it gladly." "But," says the Christ you would now fain call Saviour, "I must be Master too. I will rescue you from death, but you must follow Me to life." Here is life, but you must needs have empty hands to lay hold on it. The Saviour of men is ever figured on the Cross with arms stretched out wide to the whole breadth of space, not only in the pains which are the price of the redemption of all, but in the love which would welcome all. And He bids you come, come freely, come one and all, and be taken into the arms of His mercy. But do you shrink if you find that the hand of your Christ which you clasp has pressed the mark of blood upon you? What! is that needful? you ask Him. Yes. The fountain opened on the Cross is opened for sin and for uncleanness. You may now and always find there mercy, peace, truth; but it is God's peace, and God's mercy, and the whole pure truth; and that means that you let the blood of Christ which saves you also cleanse you. The

door of the kingdom is wide enough for all to enter, but yet not wide enough to let you smuggle so much as one sin in with you.

There was where poor Herod failed. He heard gladly, and looked wistfully at the glories of the Gospel, but between them and him stood—his passion. "That will I have," says God. "No, no! anything but that," is the reply. And so for the sake of the one idol, God and His mercy and His message are one and all rejected, and for ever.

My good friends, it may be that even now the Master is looking with hope and love upon you, as He says, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of Heaven." And you are saying to Him with more or less consciousness, "Lord, what lack I yet?" And so—seeking the one thing you lack—you turn to the "many things" of the Law of God. This selfishness! I will crush that this Lent. That too sharp tongue of mine! I will, with God's help, put a curb upon it. These carnal desires! I will trample them down. That unspiritual disposition of mine! I will try and educate it. That lack of earnestness! I will face facts and the needs of the world and my own soul till I burn with zeal. And so on goes the list, while the real need is left untouched and unseen, perhaps. It is the idol in the heart by which you are blinded and kept back. It is that and that only which God seeks to remove. It is but one thing that stands between you and the light. You need to give yourself to Christ; that, no more and no less!

For it is quite possible that Herod should have dismissed Herodias, sought forgiveness from his legal wife, and yet not entered the kingdom. That may be; but this is certain, that the very first symptom of his heart having been cleansed would have been this attack on the main sin of his life, just as surely as it was that weak passion which stood as a rock across the path of his soul's journey to God. For the experience of all Christian history teaches us this very solemn truth, that between the soul seeking the kingdom of God, as Herod's had begun to do, and the very kingdom itself stands at last but one great rock of offence. With Herod it was Herodias; with Nicodemus it was shame—the shame of public baptism and confession; with Saul of Tarsus it was self-will and pride; with one it is selfishness, with another worldly inclinations, with another some definite sin known and loved, with another indolence of character. These rocks of offence may be removed, and yet the step not be taken which will bring you into the covenant of God; but this is sure, that the step cannot be taken while that offence is clung to and shielded.

"Many things" may you do from respect for religion; "many things" may you do from a wish for a holier and a better life, and it may be good and blessed to do them. But do not let these deceive you. A good thing is always good truly. It is good to have cups and platters clean on the out-

side. But do not make the mistake of thinking that that ensures that your meat and your drink shall be taken in clean vessels. It is a very excellent thing, like Martha, to give attention to the practical details of life, so long as these do not deceive you into neglect of the one thing needful, the centre of the life made true.

There is the danger of a regular respectable religious kind of life. What God seeks is a heart humble and meek and ready to take His Will with His salvation. Do not offer Him the "many things" of religious observance moulded to no form, without spirit and without life; but give the one thing which fulfils itself in many forms, the heart touched with the cleansing blood of Christ, the penitence which keeps nothing back, but asks simply, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

This is the glory of the Gospel. It is like those truths of science which by their very simplicity unlock the doors of endless mysteries. The Gospel is the key to heaven and earth, to the knowledge of God and the knowledge of men, because it has but one word, one law, one condition; but a word which goes to the depth of the heart and life, and so moves the whole. God asks not of you the many things which are so difficult to understand, so impossible to fulfil; He asks this: *that you take the life He offers you.*

"This is *the work* of God—that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent."

I knew not what John said to Herod, but this I do know, that John's message, like His Master's word, was very simple, very direct, very uniform. "Repent," said John; "Repent," said Christ. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," said John. "I am come that ye might have life," said Christ, "and him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out."

For the Gospel of God in all times and in every mouth prepared to preach it is this, "Be ye reconciled to God." That is the "one thing" which includes all the "many things," and more.

To Herod was offered that which would have been the beginning of a true life; the word of John would have brought him to the work of Christ. He sees one thing between him and this life of God's giving, and he refuses God's offer, and chooses to remain where he was with his uneasy conscience, his sore need: with his sin,—and with his pleasure.

To you is offered the same—aye, the very same choice. Will you take the salvation of Christ's giving, the cleansing of His Blood, the sanctifying of His Spirit, the life which begins with Repent and ends with Rejoice? The Saviour of men's souls pleads with you now in far more peaceful and tender words than the Baptist had ever learned; and between you and Him—you and the kingdom of God—you and the life eternal stands but one thing—the idol of the heart. Choose then. That or Christ? Herodias or God? Sin or salvation

APPREHENSIVE NERVOUSNESS.
Debility, Rheumatism, Gout, Sciatica, Torpid Liver,
Kidney Disorders, and every form of weakness may be
speedily cured by wearing

HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.

It generates a mild continuous current of Electricity.
Produces no Shock or Discomfort whatever.
Testimonials, Pamphlet, and Advice free, personally or by letter.

Write at once to **MR. C. B. HARNESS**, Consulting Electrician, **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. LTD.**
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1888.

THE RESTORATION OF LIBERTY.

AMONG the numerous reasons which have been put forward to account for the Unionist successes in Doncaster and Deptford, and the reduction of the Gladstonian majority in Glamorganshire from 2,457 to 606 votes, there is one to which sufficient prominence has not yet been given. The electors of Doncaster and Deptford feel, in common with the rest of the nation, that under the present Government they are regaining some of the real freedom which had been lost to them through the loose principles and lax policy of the Gladstonian party. It is the same in Ireland, in London, and in Parliament. An organised attack has been made for some years past on the spirit and essence of true liberty by a band of men professing to be its chosen champions. Liberty to defy the law in Ireland, to obstruct the traffic in the public streets, to prevent Parliament from getting on with the business of the nation; this is what they have been striving for, and what (at one time) it seemed very likely they would obtain. The old principle of liberty, as defined by its great expounders—liberty to do, to say, and to think as one likes, subject to the general interests of society, as laid down by society itself—had been dethroned in favour of mere licence, under which the so-called champions of liberty aimed at becoming the enslavers of every body else. By a great effort the Unionist Government has defeated this conspiracy. All forms of revolt against law and order are being steadily brought under subjection in Ireland, the absurd claim to an unlimited right of public meeting has been snuffed out by an overwhelming parliamentary majority; and Parliament itself has recovered its own liberty out of the hands of a faction which

made use of the privileges of the minority for the purpose of defeating the will of the majority. Of these three achievements, the last, though perhaps of little popular interest, is the most remarkable in its results. A complete revolution has been effected in the House of Commons. It really does not appear to be the same assembly. The same men were there, but they appeared to have undergone a sort of transformation. Violent scenes become impossible under rules which provide for the prompt conclusion of a debate which has become irrelevant or unparliamentary, so that there is no temptation to indulge in them; dilatory motions and speeches are so obviously ineffectual that even for those who attempt them, they are a sheer waste of time. But most effective of all is the arrangement by which the sitting of the House is brought automatically to a close without detriment to the business on hand, or to the public interests involved in it. Not a single complaint has been made of any subject having been disposed of after insufficient discussion; and the House is now rejoicing in its liberty after five or six years' subjection to an unruly faction. There is much loud talk about the coming reversal of all this when the Gladstonians are returned to power—of revenge, retaliation, and so forth. The new rules of procedure are to be kept in pickle as a rod for the Unionist back; Trafalgar Square is to be re-opened as a public rioting place; and in Ireland the rule of the League is to be re-established under more or less legal forms. But in so far as such a policy would mean the restoration of lawlessness, it would be utterly opposed to the good sense and to the interests of the mass of the people, and would soon work out its own retribution. It may be safely asserted that if the state of things which existed in London last autumn were to re-arise under the Home Secretaryship of Sir William Harcourt, that eminent authority on mob law would be compelled to act precisely on the lines adopted by Mr. Matthews. He could no more tolerate the proceedings which he recently attempted to justify than he could tolerate unpunished robbery or murder. We may make our minds easy, therefore, upon that score. As for Parliament, the regulations now adopted for the better despatch of business will sit lightly on the shoulders of a party which has no disposition to obstruct it, except within the limits of legitimate intrusion and opposition. As for Ireland—those who live longest will see most. It is enough for us that we shall have done our duty in our own time; and meanwhile there is much comfort in the thought that we have helped to rid ourselves, and our fellow subjects across the Channel, of an incubus of social tyranny, and to restore liberty within the law.

THE approaching resignation of Bishop Speechly, of Travancore and Cochin, is announced.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—Passing on from the ideas of the ancients on evolution to the consideration of the opening chapters in the book of Genesis, I am aware that I am about to criticise that which has justly commanded the reverence and won the admiration of the wisest and best of men. The majority of Christians at the present day probably accept all its statements as unquestionable literal facts, and wish to know no more. The revelation of the one true God, as the great Creator and Ruler of the world, throws its *agis* over the whole. Like that charity which covers a multitude of sins, the monotheism of the Mosaic account, with its simple dignity and moral worth, raised every statement to the level of supernatural communication. Verbal inspiration and the infallibility of a book set up against that of a system are easy and indiscriminating methods, and therefore popular. Where the need of worship is strongly felt, but not that of knowledge, with its painful acquisition and perhaps more painful critical application, this state of things must needs go on. I have no wish to disturb it. I do not expect that it will be proposed to disturb it in the first subject for discussion at the Church Congress at Manchester, this next October, viz.: “To what extent results of historical and scientific criticism, especially of the Old Testament, should be recognised in sermons and teaching.” I anticipate that the general verdict will be to disturb existing convictions as little as possible, and to trust to time and the spread of education among the masses to remove gradually misconceptions and ignorance. History shows us that all religious shocks and crises are accompanied by a lowering of the moral tone. This above all should be deprecated.

But besides the unlearned and the uncritical there is an ever increasing number of pious men, who, accepting the general conclusions of those branches of science they are more or less acquainted with, are also anxious to co-ordinate their knowledge with the Bible. This is, for such minds, the one great pressing problem of the day. I venture to say that it rises above the question of vestments or of Eucharistic presence. It presses for an answer. We cannot keep any longer in separate lobes of the brain the conclusions of science and the teaching of Scripture. They must fuse somehow or the brain soften.

Now I would observe that our Church has wisely left “inspiration” undefined. It is a *sensus numinis* dependent on its effect on the heart and not on its definition. If the passages in the New Testament be carefully read, which relate to the inspiration of the Scriptures, they will be found to have purely moral and spiritual objects. Inspiration is not given to teach history, chronology, geography, ethnology, nor indeed any subject which the various writers of the Bible could know from ordinary sources. As the Introduction to my S.P.C.K. Bible, 1817, wisely says, “Nor is it to be supposed that they (the sacred writers) were inspired in every fact they related or in every precept which they delivered. They were left to the common use of their faculties and did not upon every occasion stand in need of supernatural communication.” The late learned Bishop Thirlwall

expressed the same idea when he said: “A great part of the events related in the Old Testament has no more apparent connection with our religion than those of Greek and Roman history.” Cardinal Newman, in the *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1884, restricts inspiration to “matters of faith and morals.” “Moses may have incorporated into his MSS. as much from foreign documents as is commonly maintained by the critical school.” His whole article shows that while there is a limit of free thought, there is also a wide scope for its action. Numerous other testimonies might be added, but they are unnecessary. In the opinion of divines of both Churches, it is not therefore impugning the inspiration of Holy Writ to point out where more comprehensive and more correct views of man and of nature supersede its less perfect presentations. Nor again, where possible, to indicate the sources from which its writers derive their facts and statements. It may indeed some day come to be regarded as a great and noble work to restore to men truer ideas of the Bible, at present obscured by apathy and ignorance.

All true science being progressive, if not in itself, at least in our apprehension of it, we must beware in our criticisms of the Bible not to fall into the dogmatism of our predecessors, that unhappy Child of ignorance and presumption. Here are a few instances for our warning. Geology has torn in twain the veil which hid from our eyes the great antiquity of the world, and palæontology shows that the age of man transcends our puny chronology. How pathetic the simplicity of our Biblical annotators who still print B.C. 4,004 as the date of Adam!

Have we then hardly moved from the days of Josephus (Antiq. x. 8-5), who unhesitatingly reckons 3,513 years six months and ten days from the creation of Adam to the destruction of the first Temple? We are still favoured with the date B.C. 2,247 for the confusion of tongues and the dispersion of mankind from the land of Shinar, although archæology and philology both imperatively demand a far earlier period. Divines of last century, whose commentaries are in our hands, expressed their satisfaction that “the excellent Sir William Jones has traced the origin of all people of the earth to the three roots, Shem, Ham, and Japhet.” Philology now tells a very different tale. It can only amuse geologists to be gravely told *à propos* of the Deluge that “every mountain of every region under heaven from Japan to Mexico, all conspire in one universal proof that they all had the sea spread over the highest summits,” and that this fact, with the geological remains found there, “all are a perfect demonstration that Moses’ account of the Deluge is incontestably true.” On the other hand, while we should wish to know, out of the recognised twenty-five families, 244 genera and 977 species of Reptilia, which particular one the offending serpent in the Garden of Eden belonged to, a discreet silence is maintained. Nor does it become quite clear why the remaining 976 species should suffer for the sin of a congener becoming a vehicle of temptation to our first parents, till we turn to Paradise Lost, Book X., and find Satan and his hellish crew

All transformed
Alike to serpents all, as accessories
To his bold riot.

It explains, also, why Noah, when he had the opportunity of crushing the whole Ophidian race by denying them admittance into the ark, and so avenging

Eden, did not avail himself of it. But this is turning from the point.

Long ago, I presume, the more thoughtful readers of Genesis gave up the attempt of finding room in the ark for "every beast after his kind, creeping thing and bird of every sort." A dozen arks would not suffice for the purpose, although they were arks of 42,413 tons burthen, as Dr. Hales absurdly imagines. We still have in our commentaries his innocent question: "Can we doubt of its being sufficient to contain eight persons and about 200 or 250 pair of four-footed animals (a number to which, according to Buffon, all the various distinct species may be reduced), together with all the subsistence necessary for a twelvemonth?" No, we don't doubt it at all, any more than we doubt that Buffon's 250 species have risen to 556 *genera* with 1,763 species, besides 38 *genera* of primates with 274 species, and 79 *genera* of the order of Chiroptera with 445 species. If to these be added the birds, whose species are at least twenty times as numerous as all the foregoing, and the insects, whose species are something fabulously great, we rise altogether beyond the shadow of a doubt. The new wine of modern knowledge cannot be put into the old bottles. In attempting it we gain nothing and we destroy the simplicity of the old. How great that simplicity is may be judged from the narrative in Genesis, which speaks of the serpent, the dove and the raven as though there was but one species only of each. I have already alluded to the Reptilia. As for the other two, there are 44 *genera* with 355 species of Columbidae, and 24 *genera* with 190 species of Corvidae. There is a manifest incongruity in mentioning these zoological facts by the side of the Biblical narrative. They do not harmonise. Is not the true solution of the difficulty that Moses did not rise in science above the knowledge of his day, but that he rather utilised it for the graft of the inspired monotheism of which, and not science, he was the true prophet? Permit me to answer this in my next letter.

F. T. P.

SIR,—Professor Henslow's language respecting the relations between creative purpose and natural selection is not very clear, but he believes that there is an intelligent purpose in evolution, and he thus states his view of the relation between the two agencies (PULPIT, 25th February, 1888.) :—

"The origin of all means to ends is regarded as the joint product of the action of the environment upon the responsive power of protoplasm. By this joint action the offspring appear already prepared to some extent to meet the requirements of their social (?) conditions; these incipient preparations become intensified in their offspring in turn, and thus many (not one or two, as *all* the offspring will vary simultaneously in the same direction), will survive to establish the new variety. Where natural selection acts appears to me to be mainly during the earliest periods of growth, in the elimination of the weaklings."

I understand him to mean :—

That the impulse to evolutionary changes comes from the action of the environment on the organism, continued and accumulated through generations.

That the changes are guided by creative intelligence.

And that natural selection can neither originate the process nor guide it, but only increases its efficiency, and thus accelerates it.

These propositions very nearly express my conclusions on the subject, as stated in my work on "Habit and Intelligence."* Though I am inclined to rate the direct importance of natural selection rather higher. My purpose in writing this letter, however, is to show that the same conclusion as to creative intelligence is also that of Mr. Seebohm, the eminent ornithologist, who has travelled to Siberia and many other parts of the world in order to study the habits, the migrations, and the geographical distribution of birds. I quote from his work on "The Geographical Distribution of the Charadriidae, or the Plovers, Sandpipers, Snipes, and their Allies," p. 7†

"But when we admit that the exhaustive arguments in favour of the theory of evolution, propounded by Darwin in his remarkable book on the 'Origin of Species,' prove its truth, so far as speculations on such remote events are capable of proof, we may at the same time doubt whether natural selection may be, in any sense, the cause of the origin of species. It has probably played a very important part in the history of evolution, but its rôle has been that of increasing the rapidity with which the process of development has proceeded. Of itself it has probably been absolutely powerless to originate a species; the machinery by which species have been evolved has been completely independent of natural selection, and could have produced all the results which we call the evolution of species without its aid, though the process would have been slow, had there been no struggle for life to increase its pace."

He afterwards speaks of the "fascinating simplicity" of Darwin's theory, which refers almost everything in the origin of species to natural selection, but goes on to argue that, in the wild state of animals, small variations occurring at random would not be preserved by natural selection; but that the effect of the "environment," or sum total of the external conditions of life, may be expected, and is found to change the characters of entire species. I cannot give the reasoning briefly, but I go on to quote his further conclusion as to an intelligent guidance of variation. (Pp. 14, 15.)

"White eggs are generally found correlated with a nest in a hole, or some equally concealed situation, and coloured eggs with an exposed position amongst objects somewhat similar to them in colour." [So that eggs are protected against animals that would devour them, either by being placed out of sight or by being inconspicuously coloured, but not in both ways.] "The connection between cause and effect in the latter case, appears to be so remote, so impossible to imagine, that we are tempted to call it miraculous. But are not the operations of other laws of nature to all appearance equally miraculous?" [Then, after speaking of the wonderful and inscrutable process of development within the egg, he goes on] :— "The necessity to develop, in a more or less definite and beneficial direction, which appears to be characteristic of organic matter, may possibly be analogous to the various forces for energy which are characteristic of inorganic matter. The one is as mysterious as the other. . . ."

"It may be objected that teleological variation [or variation guided by intelligence towards a purpose] is too mysterious to be accepted as a scientific dogma, but it must not be forgotten that many other accepted

* Second Edition. Macmillan, 1879.

† Henry Sotherton & Co.

dogmas are equally mysterious, such as chemical affinity or magnetic attraction.

"The laws which govern energy (force or condition, of inorganic matter) are so absolutely mysterious, that I am unable to see anything unscientific in the theory that organic matter may also have its peculiar energy (forces or conditions), and that one of these produces the effects which may be called beneficial or teleological variation."

The same conclusion has been more concisely stated by the eminent American botanist, Asa Gray, in the saying that "variation has been led along certain beneficial lines."

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, April 2nd, 1888.

MR. LAWRENCE ON MEANS AND VEHICLE.

SIR,—Mr. Lawrence quotes a sentence of mine, and says that it is equivalent with what he says. Now I will requote my words, "to speak of the manner of reception is a totally different thing from speaking of that which is received." This is almost a truism. To speak of how we receive the inward grace of the Eucharist, is very different from saying what that grace is. This sentence of mine is harmless and almost colourless. I will now quote Mr. Lawrence's words, to which he says mine are equivalent. "Means whereby we receive the same,"—the words of the Church Catechism,—"declares that the elements are the vehicle by which grace is conveyed." Most excellent and most catholic. But now he proceeds, "Mean, whereby our Lord's Body is received and eaten, or taken and received, does not apply to, or refer to a vehicle; for a vehicle, by which food is eaten, means nothing whatever." This is incomprehensible. Mystery 1. "A mean is not a vehicle." Mystery 2. "A vehicle by which food is eaten means nothing whatever." I will not attempt to answer this, because I have not the least idea what it means. But this I must say, that it no more resembles what I have said, either in sound or sense, than any other meaningless sentence which he could put together. If all Mr. Lawrence intends to convey is, that faith or piety is the mean on *our* part, as the elements are on God's part, nobody will disagree with that statement; but if, by calling faith "the means," or the sole means, he would exclude the elements from being the ordinary vehicle or means on God's part, I totally disagree with him, and must say that this is the error into which the Revision Report and the New Question and Answer have fallen.

INQUIRENS.

SIR,—From Divinity we have now come to plain English. This is satisfactory, because we are now within the range of common sense. Mr. Lawrence distinguishes between a means and a vehicle, but Johnson says that "a vehicle is a means by which anything is conveyed"—so I must leave Mr. Lawrence and Johnson to settle the matter together.

2. "He," he says, meaning me, "does not understand that words can have different imports in different places." By his leave, I understand that very well; but now for the application of this aphorism. "Means whereby we receive the same," declares that the elements are the vehicle by which grace is con-

veyed. Exactly! this is what I say. But now let us hear Mr. Lawrence—almost every word being in italics, to emphasize I know not what. "Mean, whereby our Lord's Body is received and eaten, or taken and received, does not apply to, or refer to, a vehicle." Yet Johnson says a means is a vehicle—so there is a distinction here without a difference. But now for Mr. Lawrence's reason. "For, a vehicle, by which food is eaten, means nothing whatever." I will not attempt to controvert or criticise this, because I have not the very slightest idea what Mr. Lawrence means, when he translates. I will speak again. I can only guess that Mr. Lawrence holds a corporal presence, so that His corporal presence cannot be the means of conveying itself. Unless he means this, I am entirely in the dark, and then, when he calls the elements the means, he says, with Rome, that the corporal body unites us to His Corporal Body!

3. Mr. Lawrence says that the Synod did not adopt the whole report. Very likely, but they did adopt its question and answer, founded on the heretical reasonings of the report. Besides, the report is signed by the leading spirits of the Synod, and was in effect, adopted by it. I see the names attached of Master Brooke, Dean Daunt, the Bishop, present, of Cashel (then Dean Day), Col. Ffolliott, the late Provost Jellett, the late Provost Lloyd, the present Archbishop of Dublin, the present Bishop of Meath, Mr. W. Barlow-Smythe, the present Bishop of Ossory. There are some dissidents—Dr. Ball, the present Provost, Archdeacon Kyle, Dean MacDonnell and Mr. Pilkington—for reasons not given. If the names signed do not carry the voice of the Synod, nothing could.

4. Mr. Lawrence does not like my calling the Synod "deplorable"; but, if I think so, for its false ruling, why not? nor my calling the question and answer "wretched," but if I think them built on the heresy of the report, why not?

5. Mr. Lawrence says, of the Catechism, that it says that faith is the means "by which the Body and Blood are taken and received." This is a mistake. It says no such thing. It says that the bread and wine are the means, but that only the faithful are partakers of Christ, though others eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing. Though, as he says, "the elements are the vehicle by which grace is conveyed," yet, like sermons, lessons, &c., they benefit only those who do not interpose the obstacle of impenitence.

THE WRITER OF THE COMMUNICATED
"PRETENDED ELOGE."

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." April, 1888. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

WE do not think very highly of Professor Godet's article on the Epistle to the Hebrews, although it begins with a very good sentence. Contrasting it with the Epistle of James—the moral law translated into the royal law,—with the Epistle of St. Peter—theocratic privileges translated into Church privileges,—Professor Godet says: "In the Epistle to the Hebrews the whole system of ceremonial worship is transferred to the heavenlies, and invested with a spiritual and truly life-giving significance."

The first part of the article is much the best, the latter part is on the authorship of the Epistle, and is written in that tone of certainty as to what Paul and Silas and Barnabas and Apollos and others could and could not do, to which a certain class of commentators have attained, and which we used to wonder at; but we have got used to it now.

If Mr. Rendall's paper on the History of the word "Eternal" can be summarized, it would be, that the word is used in antithesis to earthly rather than to transitory.

We can only refer the student to Professor Cheyne's paper on the Book of Isaiah in the Revised Version; all Hebrew students will of course make a note of it.

Principal Brown's paper, answering the rationalists who maintain that the doctrine of the Miraculous Conception is a myth unknown to St. Peter or St. Paul, would be an exceedingly good one, only that he has unfortunately quite misunderstood some remarks in Dean Plumptre's "Christ and Christendom." Dean Plumptre is as little inclined to make light of fundamental doctrines as any living man.

Reviewing Mr. Hutton's essays recently published, Dr. Marcus Dods says, "Like Dante's Vergil, Matthew Arnold has carried a lantern behind his back, guiding those who come after him, but shedding no ray into the darkness that hangs over his own path." This is an admirable simile.

Five articles, all good, make up the number.

ON March 23 a court, appointed by the Bishop of Liverpool, held an inquiry into charges of demeanour unbecoming a clergyman on the part of the vicar of Farnworth, near Widnes, the Rev. George Bond. The specific allegations were that he had been the worse for drink while solemnising a marriage, while performing the funeral ceremony over a child of one of his parishioners, and while baptising a child. The President of the court, after hearing evidence in private, announced that there was a *prima facie* case for instituting further proceedings.

ON March 22 Bishop Mitchinson held a confirmation at the parish church of St. Luke, Old Street. There was a large number of candidates, and the service was not over until nearly ten o'clock. On returning to the rectory his lordship learned that a poor lad who had been prepared and was anxious for the holy rite had been unable to get away from his work in time to take his place with the other candidates. The right rev. prelate at once went back to the church, and there, in the great quiet building, where literally only "two or three were gathered together," repeated the service.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

THE Bishop of Rochester has written a letter to Archdeacon Burney asking him to convene a special committee to report on the present condition of the diocesan branch of the Church of England Temperance Society. His lordship, in concluding, re-

marks—"Some of us have doubts as to the value of Temperance Sunday. They are not shared by me; but I shall be glad that they should be discussed, weighed, and reported upon. The quality and usefulness of what goes by the name of temperance entertainments is open to grave suspicion. The Church has a great moral and religious work to do in reclaiming the victims of intemperance; and this cannot be done only by tea, the banjo, and humorous recitations. While we fully appreciate the importance of recreative and social helps, we must not elevate them to an importance which they do not deserve. To vulgarise our great cause in the eyes of the public at large is to destroy it."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Cooke, Rev. A. H., Rector of Trevalga, Cornwall.
 Corr, Rev. John, Chaplain of Dover Prison.
 Davidson, Rev. E., Incumbent of the French Anglican Church of St. John-the-Evangelist, Bloomsbury-street.
 Ford, Rev. W. H., Curate of St. Mary's, Cheadle; Vicar of New Buckenham, Norfolk.
 Handcock, Rev. R. G., Minister of All Saints' Chapel, Lansdown, Bath.
 Heywood, Rev. Henry R., Vicar of Swinton, near Manchester; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Lancashire.
 Ince, Rev. H. G., M.A., Senior Curate of the Parish Church, Wakefield; Vicar of Stanley, near Wakefield.
 Mackie, Rev. G. E., Assistant-Master of Epsom College; Head Master of the Godolphin Grammar-school, Hammersmith.
 Marsham, Rev. C. D. B., M.A., Vicar of Stoke Lyne and Caversfield, Oxon; Rector of Harrietsham, Kent.
 Munn, Rev. Joseph Shepherd, Curate-in-Charge of St. Mark's, New Ferry, Bebington.
 Pickop, Rev. James, B.A., Curate of St. Luke's, Heywood; Rector of Hatcliffe, near Great Grimby, Lincolnshire.
 Roxby, Rev. E. L., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Brighton; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Tulse-hill.
 Walford, Rev. C., M.A., late Chaplain, Bombay; Rector of Padworth, Berks.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Ambrose, Rev. John, M.A., at Copford Lodge, after a long and painful illness, on the 1st inst., aged 67.
 Butt, Rev. George, M.A. (Ch. Ch., Oxon), for thirty-seven years Vicar of Chesterfield, at Chesterfield Vicarage, on the 28th ult., aged 72.
 Duncombe, Rev. Edward, formerly Rector of Newton Kyme, and of Barthomley, at Barthomley, on the 25th ult., aged 79.
 Ellis, Rev. Fitzhenry William, M.A., Retired Chaplain H.M. Indian Service, at 21, Gloucester-place, Hyde Park, W., on the 28th ult.
 Gibbings, Rev. Richard, D.D., Canon of Kildare, and formerly for fifteen years Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Trinity College, Dublin, at Rome, on the 14th ult., in his 75th year.
 Hardy, Rev. John Frederic, B.D., Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, at Cambridge, on the 27th ult., aged 62.
 Hayes, Rev. William, M.A., Chaplain of St. Katharine's Hospital, Regent's Park, at 31, St. Mark's-crescent, Regent's Park, on the 31st ult., aged 75.
 Nicholl, Rev. William Lloyd, Rector of Wolferlow, at Wolferlow Rectory, Herefordshire, on the 27th ult.
 Quekett, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Warrington, passed peacefully away at the Rectory, Warrington, on the 29th ult., aged 85 years.
 Rudd, Rev. Leonard H., M.A., of Kempsey, late of Ruscombe and Twyford, at Upper Norwood, on the 26th ult.
 Tew, Rev. Edmund, M.A., Oxon, thirty-three years Rector of Patching, on the 29th ult., aged 72.
 Trinder, Rev. Daniel, M.A., Vicar and Rural Dean of Highgate, and formerly Vicar of Teddington, at Gibraltar, on the 2nd inst., aged 59.



The Church of England Pulpit.

PROFANITY.

BY THE REV. JAMES HAMILTON, M.A., RECTOR
OF DUNBOYNE, CO. MEATH.

SERMON PREACHED AT DUNBOYNE, ON SUNDAY,
FEBRUARY 26TH, 1888.

"And Esau said unto his father, Hast thou but one blessing, my father? Bless me, even me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept."—GENESIS xxvii. 38.

"Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears."—HEBREWS xii. 16, 17.

THE story of how Rebecca and Jacob deceived and outwitted Isaac and Esau is a very ugly one indeed. It presents a sad picture of a house divided against itself, and of the sorrow and misery which follow as an invariable consequence. But I think, as a rule, that only one side of the picture has been considered by preachers and expositors. The part which Rebecca and Jacob played is always dwelt upon, and their conduct is most justly held up to condemnation and censure. It is really impossible to say a word in their favour. To-day, however, I purpose departing a little from the usual course, and consider, not the conduct of Rebecca and Jacob, but that of Isaac and Esau. The latter pair have very generally won for themselves sympathy on account of the awful deceit and treachery of which they were the victims. And that this should be the case is perfectly natural. God has planted in every breast a sense of justice, so that a man cannot stand by and see an act of injustice or wrong perpetrated without having roused within him a feeling of righteous indignation. It is on this principle that society chiefly relies for protection. And it is to this feeling of indignation stirred up by the sight of injury or injustice to which St. Paul refers when he says, "Be ye angry and sin not." No man, unless he stifles within him a divine impulse, can help being angry at the sight of wrong or injury, and it prompts him to endeavour to have justice done and wrong redressed. But St. Paul knew the tendency of this principle to be abused when he added, *and sin not*. He knew how Satan, who perverts everything good into an occasion to sin, changes this natural feeling of righteous indignation into mere spite and bitterness and a desire for revenge. This is illustrated in the case of Esau. It was quite natural and right for him to be angry with his brother for having

deceived him, but it was dreadfully sinful and wicked of him to turn this feeling into a desire for vengeance.

But I am afraid we allow the deceit of Rebecca and Jacob to blind us to the real character of Isaac and Esau. It is a most difficult thing to judge impartially of the merits or demerits of two opposite sides. We somehow unconsciously lean to one side or another, and we like or dislike for no intelligible reason that we can give. We have the strongest possible reasons for condemning the conduct of Rebecca and Jacob, but I do not think that we have ever rightly considered on what grounds Isaac and Esau are worthy of our sympathy. I suppose, to put it briefly, we condemn one party for being deceivers, and we sympathise with the other because they were deceived. It seems to me, however, that the deceit was not all on one side. If we will only look at the story carefully, we shall discover that Isaac and Esau were not only deceived themselves, but that they were also, to some extent at least, deceivers. Why was Isaac so determined upon giving the blessing to Esau at all? Was it not going in direct opposition to the Divine Will? Had not God revealed it at the birth of the children that the elder should serve the younger? therefore distinctly pointing out Jacob as the one on whom he was to bestow the blessing. It was not a matter, either, upon which he could plead ignorance, as the Lord had distinctly made known His will to him. Then, again, Esau had proved himself to be utterly incapable of receiving any such honour. The special reason why Abraham was called by God to leave his home and kindred was to create a separate people, amongst whom the true worship of Jehovah might be preserved. They were in no way to mix themselves up with the surrounding heathenism. For this purpose look at the care and anxiety of Abraham not to allow Isaac to marry into any of the heathen families round about; think of the long journey of Eleazer upon which he was dispatched by his master, and his earnest prayer that the Lord might guide him in the choice of a wife for the son of promise, and his wonderful gratitude to Jehovah in causing him to meet with Rebecca. Now just mark the conduct of Esau in this respect. He not only disregarded the Divine will. He apparently never thought of it—but he also disregarded the will of his parents. He married two heathen wives, to the great and inconsolable grief of the latter. If Esau had become the inheritor of Isaac's blessing, the true worship of God which had been kindled in Abraham would have been extinguished in Esau, because he does not seem to have shown any regard for religion whatever. And yet Isaac's extreme partiality for Esau blinded him to all this. He does not seem to have considered whether, after his decease, the family altar would continue erected to Jehovah, or whether it would be replaced for one dedicated to some Hittite deity. He seems to have utterly lost sight of the distinctly

religious purpose of the blessing. Isaac had evidently a consciousness that he was not altogether acting rightly. This meal, which he had directed Esau to provide and prepare, seems to have no proper significance except that it was intended to divert Rebecca's attention from supposing that anything unusual was about to take place. He knew if she even suspected she would use her utmost effort to prevent him carrying out his plan. As Esau and he had often had a meal of venison together when the latter returned from his hunting, they would never be suspected as having any other motive for being together on this occasion. The whole of this manœuvring was evidently intended for secrecy and to conceal the whole affair from Rebecca. In this light, then, I think Isaac's conduct does not appear favourable. It was utterly unholy to seek to confer an office on one manifestly unfit, and also in opposition to the Divine will. His conduct would seem to be much the same as if a Bishop at the present day were to ordain his own son from mere personal motives, and present him to a living, utterly regardless of his fitness for the ministry. It was everything, also, but straightforward in his effort to conceal his scheme under the pretence of a feast.

Now turn to Esau, and see what are his claims upon our sympathy. I have already partly anticipated this by referring to his conduct in marrying heathen wives. By this act alone he had forfeited his claim to be his father's successor. But further, he had parted with all title to that blessing long before. He had sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. And, although we must condemn the mean and despicable way in which Jacob obtained it, yet Esau had no right whatever to deceitfully try and set aside his bad bargain. He ought to have remembered that whatever he had pledged to his brother, although, perhaps, very unwisely, was no longer his own. If Esau had been honourable he would have considered his promise most sacred. We should be very careful about making promises, but still more careful about breaking them. It is very remarkable, also, that it is Esau's conduct with regard to the birthright which the sacred writers condemn. He is called "profane." Now the birthright (right of first-born) in patriarchal times implied not merely large temporal blessings, but also religious offices and privileges. The first-born was the priest—Jehovah's minister in the family. To stand before the Lord as His minister to direct His people's worship is surely the highest honour which could be conferred on any one. To despise this is to despise Jehovah. Esau sold it to Jacob for a meal of lentil pottage. This reveals his real character. He was evidently a man who had no regard for God or His religion. He took no delight and thought that there was no honour in performing His service. The birthright, remember, contained the right to the blessing. As long as it was merely connected with religious functions Esau

disregarded it. He would never have shed a tear if he had only been deprived of spiritual rights. But when he found that he was deprived of his temporal prospects, then, and not till then, did the exceeding bitter cry ascend. This selling of the birthright must have been more serious than even we can conceive, or the sacred writers would not have used such strong language in condemning it. It must have been considered as nothing short of an insult to Jehovah. Some people think that the circumstances ought to be a sufficient excuse for Esau's conduct. I don't think so. I believe his language was utterly exaggerated. There was not the slightest danger of him dying of hunger in his father's home. Isaac was a rich man, and there was surely no difficulty in providing a meal. He only needed to exercise a little patience until it was prepared. Jacob's meal was ready, and tempting to a hungry person. He would not wait a moment. His hunger must be satisfied at any cost—even at the cost of dishonouring Jehovah. Probably he never even thought of what his bargain entailed. He acted on blind impulse. Just like too many at the present day, and, indeed, in every age, who gratify every passion and desire of their nature, utterly regardless of what the price which they offer for such gratification involves. But when they come to realise what they have really forfeited, then there goes up the exceeding bitter cry. Esau's conduct, then, was deceitful in endeavouring to obtain the blessing—the title to which he had really given away. He was one of those people who think they can have their cake and eat it too. Therefore I think we can easily see the grounds of his repentance and sorrow, which is so pathetically described in our text. His sorrow was not godly sorrow, but merely remorse on account of the temporal advantages which he had forfeited. His bitter grief was not on account of having despised the religion of Abraham and made light of the worship of Jehovah. Jacob, with all his meanness, had a decided regard for Jehovah's ordinances, and was careful not to mix himself up with the heathen round about. In all his weakness, he still clung to God and would not let Him go until He blessed him. It was quite different with Esau. While there is much in his character to admire, we have no hint to show us that God was in any of his thoughts. It was this which rendered his repentance unavailing. He had no thought of having injured God. He only thought of the injury done to himself. It was his own personal loss which caused the exceeding bitter cry. There is nothing, therefore, in this rejection of Esau to lead us to suppose that it was done on mere arbitrary grounds. It was simply because it was not of the right sort. No man who will arise and go to his Father, and confess that he has sinned against Him but will be received without any other condition. If, like the Psalmist, we say "Against Thee only have I sinned," and leave all selfish considerations out of

the question, we shall also, like him, realise the "blessedness of the man whose unrighteousness is forgiven and whose sin is covered."

DEATH OF THE GERMAN EMPEROR.

BY THE REV. C. B. BRIGSTOCKE, M.A., ENGLISH CHAPLAIN, AND AUTHOR OF "QUEEN VICTORIA'S JUBILEE," "THE MODERN ATHEIST," AND OTHER SERMONS.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH, HOMBURG, GERMANY, ON SUNDAY MORNING, MARCH 11TH, 1888.

"Be still, and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the nations, I will be exalted in the earth. The Lord of Hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge."
—Ps. xlv. 10, 11.

THE duty to which we are summoned by the Psalmist in the words before us is a duty at no time inappropriate, but specially befitting the present crisis. Lent, as I have already reminded you, is a season that has been for centuries devoted by the faithful to special religious exercises; to prayer and penitence, to self-mortification and a certain abstraction from the world and its common amusements. And, brethren, we need such a season; for the hurry of our daily life thrusts out of sight vital truth. Hence it happens that the lives of most of us, Christians though we call ourselves, so sadly lack earnestness and consistency, and differ so slightly, it is to be feared, from those of the careless, pleasure-loving God-forgetting world around us. We need a special summons, "Stand in awe and sin not" (Ps. iv. 4); for there are mighty powers at work around us, which elude our observation mainly through the majestic silence with which they operate, but which occasionally do arrest our attention and reveal to us, or at any rate ought to reveal to us, the utter insignificance of man! We need to be roused to keep at the greatest possible distance from sin; for we live in a world of temptation and have hearts pre-disposed to evil. We need often to "commune with our own hearts" and to "be still." We need to get away from the haunts of men, to isolate ourselves at times from this visible world, to enter by anticipation that world of silence and mystery towards which we are all hastening, and in the presence of the Eternal Being that sways the universe to contemplate steadily the stern realities before each one of us—Death, Judgment, Eternity!

Meditation is the great duty of Lent—meditation upon God and our relationship to Him. And this duty has received a startling emphasis within the last few days.

On Friday last a great man fell, and his fall has cast a dark shadow over the whole country in

which we now live. Thus the highest home in the land has been deprived of its head; the most powerful nation in Europe has lost her beloved and trusted Emperor, and Europe itself its most striking and prominent figure for the last quarter of a century or more.

Death is always the unexpected. As the heathen philosopher wrote centuries ago, the old man always expects to live another year. The death of an Emperor, who was born three years before the present century, and who had exceeded by twenty years the ordinary limit of human life as stated by the Psalmist, could not, in the strict sense of the term, be called an unexpected event. Still we can readily sympathise with that shock of surprise and almost incredulity with which the crowds that besieged his palace in Berlin listened on Friday morning to the sad tidings of the Emperor's decease. The monarch had of late years rallied after similar attacks. He possessed a marvellous vitality, and the people, having seen him only a week ago smiling upon them from his study window with all the friendliness of a hale old man, and associating with him none of the decrepitude and languor which are the ordinary attendants of extreme old age, could not bring themselves to believe that they should no more be permitted to see in the flesh the one great object of their loyalty and love—that their aged Emperor had at last passed out of their sight and entered another world. And we, too, have so often read of the Emperor's almost supernatural activity and strength—of his doing and doing well work which would have over-taxed men very much his juniors—that we allowed ourselves to expect, and indeed indulged the hope—not under the circumstances an extravagant one—that for some years yet he would hold the sceptre wisely and well over the German Empire. Indeed, as has been remarked by the leading journal in England, the world were getting accustomed to "the sight of a nonagenarian discharging all the functions of sovereignty with scrupulous and punctual devotion," and thus the sorrowful tidings of the Emperor's death—flashed as it was by the telegraph wires on Friday last from capital to capital—affected with surprise and corresponding grief, not Germany or England alone, but the whole of the civilised world.

Germany has become a great power not only during the lifetime of the deceased monarch, but mainly through his active administration. Most of us can remember him as merely King of Prussia. It was only at the conclusion of the Franco-German war in 1871—17 years ago—that the then King of Prussia was crowned German Emperor at Versailles, amid the acclamations of the kings and princes of the Fatherland who had, in the previous campaign shared his fortunes and enjoyed his triumphs. Germany has gone on since then extending her influence and strengthening her

position. She owes much to the bravery and discipline of her troops, and to the wisdom and energy of her statesmen, but she would be ungrateful indeed if she forgot her deep debt of gratitude to the man, who may be fairly described as the source of their inspiration, and who seems in early life to have conceived the idea of delivering his country from her hereditary foe, and placing her in an independent position amongst the nations of Europe. That work he accomplished, and the love and admiration that followed him to the last, on the part of his subjects, were at once his reward, and a testimony to the completeness with which the work had been accomplished.

The name of William I. — the first German Emperor of the House of Hohenzollern—will not soon be forgotten. It will descend to posterity as indissolubly connected with the consolidation and unity of the German Empire. The people regarded their monarch with feelings little short of idolatry. Nor is this much to be wondered at; for to the German mind the late Emperor typified the realisation of their long-cherished ideal—that ideal which had long eluded the grasp of philosophers and statesmen, but which he translated into fact with the aid of that magnificent army which he himself had been the means in a great measure of calling into existence, which he regarded with the utmost veneration and affection, and was in the habit of addressing as his “children,” and of which he prided himself on being the Commander-in-Chief.

We all know that in these days in which our lot is cast, sovereigns are often regarded with distrust and jealousy, aye, and with positive hatred. They are looked upon as men who owe their exalted position either to birth or fortune, or as having elevated themselves at the expense of their subjects, and as being consequently callous to the sufferings of the millions over whom they rule. In the case before us there has been no such dark cloud intervening between Sovereign and people. The affection of the people for their Emperor—at any rate of late years—has been continuous and uninterrupted and often touching. We notice this fact as one of special interest; for we are sure that no sovereign retains for a lengthened period the cordial esteem and the true-hearted loyalty of his people, without having thoroughly deserved them.

This is not the place, nor am I in a position to place before you the leading incidents in the life of this remarkable man. This will be done doubtless during the present week by many far more competent to undertake the task. I cannot, however, refrain from drawing your attention to one or two features in the character of the late Emperor, and so commending his memory to your affectionate sympathy.

His extraordinary activity claims attention. For upwards of seventy years out of the ninety that he lived, his life, as has been said, was a constant

round of activity, both physical and mental. We read of his entering Paris with the allied armies in the year 1814. He was then seventeen, and a Prussian officer in the suite of his father. Constant occupation was ever his delight. He learned early to turn a deaf ear to the siren call of pleasure. In his youth he was ever ready to postpone the claims of ease and self-indulgence, to the higher and more sacred ones of duty. He learned the art of governing men, from the readiness with which as a subaltern he had submitted to those placed over him. And did not the monarch find his reward for the ceaseless activity of a long life in the hale and hearty old age with which he was blessed? None could see him—and we had the pleasure of seeing him here a few years ago during the autumnal review—without being conscious of his evident enjoyment of life. His end was doubtless what he himself would have wished. No protracted illness—no lingering sufferings—no mental imbecility. He died, as we say, literally in harness. The very day before he died we are told of his having summoned to his bed-side his trusted minister, and signing an order for the speedy prorogation of Parliament. We read also of his having had on the same day an affecting interview with his infirm and ever-devoted consort, and speaking freely to other attached relations.

Indeed we might almost apply to him the language that the inspired historian applied to the great legislator of Israel at the time of his death: “His eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.”

Another estimable feature in the character of the late Emperor was his love of peace. He was a thorough soldier, and yet we have no hesitation in saying that he was not fond of war. He had seen and known too much of its horrors. No one would dream of accusing the victor of Sadowa and Sedan, the captor of Paris, and the life-long friend of Prince Bismarck of any want of manliness or bravery. In the year 1870, when many from the mere weight of years—for he was then upwards of seventy—would have claimed release from the toils and inevitable hardships of a campaign, the Emperor cheerfully shared with his own soldiers the perils of war, hoping thus to ensure prosperity to the country he loved, and to achieve her deliverance from the dangers that threatened her. War was forced upon him by circumstances that he could not control. It was to him, as it must be to all earnest philanthropic men, a most painful necessity as it is an outrage upon the religion we profess. We need not be told that his personal influence over the Czar of Russia, has often been a powerful element in the preservation of peace. We believe that the instincts of the Emperor's nature were all on the side of peace; and that in spite of the wars, the successful wars, in which he was engaged, it was his chief desire and his constant aim to secure the unspeakable blessings of lasting peace,

not only for himself and people, but for the world at large.

And then, lastly : we must not forget that the late German Emperor was a God-fearing man. We should be doing grave injustice to his memory if we were to overlook this important factor in his character, and which helps to explain his buoyant hopefulness ; the earnest conscientiousness of his long-continued activity, and his zealous discharge to the very last of the important and grave functions of his august office. His religion was of a sturdy type. His faith in God was the faith of a little child. A firm believer in an over-ruling Providence he recognised God's Hand on the field of battle in the victories awarded to his troops, and gratefully traced to the same Hand his own preservation from dangers — his own long-continued health and strength.

He accepted the Bible as God's own revelation of Himself, and his mind does not seem to have been disturbed by the many perplexing problems of the present day. In an age of materialism, and in a country where scepticism is thought to be undermining the foundations of religious belief, it is truly refreshing to hear of the patriarchal sovereign listening with deepest interest on his death-bed to the Psalms of David, and in his hour of weakness deriving strength and consolation from the inspired assurances of Divine help.

His last act on earth was an act of faith in the Church into which he had been baptized in his infancy. It was more. It was an act of allegiance to the great Head of the Church, his Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. He did that which his Lord had commanded him to do, "in remembrance of" Him. On Thursday last the dying Emperor received the Holy Communion at the hand of the Court chaplain. "I heard a voice from heaven, saying, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth : Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours ; for their works follow with them."

The Emperor has passed away ! but, as has been remarked, amidst "unusual distress and uncertainty." Who of us can tell what the next chapter of German history may be, or how far disturbing forces have been held in check out of respect to the aged and peace-loving sovereign ? All admit that the elements of a general conflagration are not far to seek. May we not say that the general lesson of the sorrowful event that we have been contemplating this day is contained in the words of the Psalmist before us :—"Be still and know that I am God." If as Christians we believe in God's providential ruling of this lower world, and have been taught that not a sparrow falls to the ground without His permission, much more should we recognise His hand in the fall of a sovereign and be prepared reverently to admit that He ordereth all things as seemeth best to His godly wisdom.

"The waves of the sea are mighty and rage horribly ; but yet the Lord who dwelleth on high is mightier." Amid prevailing perplexity our consolation is that "The Lord reigneth."

But, brethren, while paying our tribute of respect to the memory of the departed Emperor, let us not forget the survivors. They need our reverent sympathy and prayers. Let us pray that the closing years of the aged and esteemed and now widowed Empress may be blessed with an abundance of God's own gift of peace. Let us pray, too, that the present Emperor may be enabled to walk in the steps of his wise father ; may bear his present sore trial with manly and Christian fortitude, and in spite of it may reign over a prosperous, contented and united people.

CANON PULLEINE will be consecrated Bishop-Suffragan of Ripon by the Archbishop of York at his cathedral on St. Mark's Day.

THE Prolocutor and other members of the Lower House of York Convocation have presented Canon Trevor, on his return to Convocation, with the scarlet gown and hood of the degree of D.D., conferred on him by the University of Durham *honoris causa*.

THE *City Press* states that the memoir of the late Primate, which the Dean of Windsor and the Rev. W. Benham are writing, will contain a very interesting chapter of reminiscences by his Grace's sister, the late Lady Wake. Her ladyship, who was educated as a Presbyterian, was confirmed, at the age of seventy, by her brother when Bishop of London.

THE Rev. J. Ellis, who is well known as taking a sturdy position on the subject of Home Rule and as an earnest advocate of it, has voluntarily resigned the living of Wilsden, Yorkshire, which is worth £300 a year. He has done so because he is altogether out of touch with the political leanings of his Church, not only on many matters of ordinary Church polity, but notably with regard to disendowment. He has no other living in view.—*Manchester Guardian*.

THE States of Jersey have forwarded to Her Majesty a petition against the appointment of the Rev. P. R. P. Braithwaite, vicar of St. Luke's, Jersey, to the deanery of the island. They contend that the appointment, made on the advice of Lord Salisbury, is illegal, on the ground that Mr. Braithwaite is not a native of the island or one of the twelve rectors of parishes, as required by the ecclesiastical law, and by custom ; and, further, that under the statute of James I. no change can be introduced in law except by agreement between the Crown and the local authorities.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico ; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

Certain HARNESS Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
FOR
RHEUMATISM
 Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh,
 writes:—"The Electropathic Belt has completely
 cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense
 agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."
 Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of
 Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the
 Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of
 Testimonials. Pamphlet & Advice free on
 application to **Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting**
Electrician, the Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
Only Address, LONDON, W.
52, OXFORD ST. (Corner of Rathbone Place.)
 Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 14, 1888.

THE TITHE RENT-CHARGE BILLS.

WE are glad to see that Lord Salisbury is making another attempt to settle, if possible, this thorny and complicated question. He is wise to deal with the subject in three separate Bills, as he thereby increases the chance of one at least passing the legislature. Although there are provisions in all of them which some persons will object to, it will be a source of pleasure and satisfaction if some plan can be adopted which will allay the agitation that at present exists. For the present we will leave the provisions of the second and third Bills relating to the revaluation and redemption of the tithe rent-charge for discussion in a future article. The main provisions of the first Bill are the shifting of the liability for payment from the occupier to the landlord, and the abolition of distraint to recover the payment. Since the Commutation Act of 1836 the landlord has held the land subject to the payment of a quasi rent-charge, the value of one-tenth of the produce, and inasmuch as the nature and extent of this produce or fruit of the earth is wholly due to, and dependent on, the skill and capital and exertions of the tenant or occupier, the responsibility of paying this so-called rent-charge has naturally and properly rested on the shoulders of the tenant, but of course an allowance has been made to him for it in the rent. All rates, taxes and other charges on the land are ultimately paid by the landlord, because the rent is reduced in proportion to them. Moreover, tithe was originally given as the consideration for the moral, spiritual and educational services of the village priest, and who so proper to pay for such services as the direct re-

cipients of them? The same observation will apply to monasteries and colleges, which were largely endowed with tithes from the land. It is a sound old English principle, and is, we think, the essence of good and economical government, to directly connect service with payment, and the fulfilment of duty with the tenure of property. Believing as we do that redemption and the final extinction of this uneconomical and variable charge is the only true, satisfactory and final remedy for the tithe difficulty, we accept the proposal to make the land-owner primarily and personally liable for payment of tithe as a step in this direction, and for this reason only is it expedient and justifiable. In these radical and democratic times we think Lord Salisbury would have gained more easily the approval and concurrence of all parties in the country had he boldly propounded a scheme for the *compulsory* redemption of the tithe. If we mistake not the plan of redemption was never more feasible than at the present time, when the ablest politicians of all parties in the state, Radical Liberal and Conservative, are banded together to prevent the dismemberment of the Empire. Surely Lord Salisbury, himself no mean financier, with such able adjutants as Mr. Goschen, Lord Hartington, Mr. Chamberlain, and Lord Randolph Churchill, can carry a redemption scheme through Parliament in a tithe of the time, and with a tithe of the trouble that it will take them to pass Lord Salisbury's three tinkering Bills, which when passed will satisfy few if any of the numerous parties interested in tithes.

Lord Salisbury's first Bill, which makes the land itself, instead of only its precarious produce, and all other property of the landowner, in future responsible for the payment of tithes, will obviously enormously enhance the value and security of this kind of property at the expense of the landowner. And as a matter of course and of justice the landowner will claim a considerable compensation for undertaking such a liability. We seriously doubt whether it is worth the tithe-owner's while to pay such compensation. We strongly counselled the clergy to accept the small compensation to the landlord of a 5 per cent. deduction if paid within three months, which Lord Salisbury offered in his Bill of last year. That was foolishly objected to, and this year a much heavier compensation is asked for, and we fear will have to be given if the Bills are to get through the House of Commons. If this provision can be obtained on any reasonable terms, it will we doubt not be hailed with gratitude by every tithe-owner in the kingdom.

Consequent on the transference of the payment of tithe rent-charge from the occupier to the owner of the soil, there is a provision which we think to be of special value to the Church as a corporate body and to the clerical tithe-owner, viz.: the abolition of distraint on the goods of the occupier for recovery of tithe. In case the tithe rent-charge is

not paid the landowner can be sued in the County Court, in just the same way as for any other ordinary debt. This is a great gain. Anything more disagreeable to a clergyman and more injurious to his spiritual vocation than to have to distress a parishioner by selling some of his chattels in order to obtain payment of that which is lawfully due to him can hardly be imagined. At present this is the only way in which payment can be obtained, and to adopt it places the clergyman in a most invidious position; he is responsible for his parishioners' souls, he is their appointed teacher and guide, yet because a farmer, from some cause or other, fails to pay his rent-charge a distraint must be levied on his goods. If recourse is had to this process the clergyman is ever afterwards looked upon as an exactor of heavy burdens, an oppressor, and the cry is raised by the dissenters, Why should we pay for a Church we do not frequent, and whose ministrations we do not believe in? The whole relationship between pastor and people is thereby strained to the utmost, and a pastor's influence for good and his ministrations for edification are well nigh abolished. At the same time, the clergyman must live by his profession as well as others, and must pay his way, so that his income must be secured to him. We are sure that the influence and the stability of the Church will be promoted by this provision of Lord Salisbury's Bill. We believe that considerable misapprehension prevails amongst clergymen as well as laymen as to the real nature, value and security of the tithe rent-charge. These points were very lucidly and succinctly explained in a paper by a Layman, entitled, "A Few Words on the Question of the Tithe Rent-Charge," which we printed in our issue of January 28th, 1888. They are from the pen of an able solicitor, who has had a life-long experience in practically dealing with tithes. It is a short paper, and, as we think, deserving of the attention of all parties interested in this vexed question.

THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.

(Continued from page 139.)

CHAPTER II.

THE APOSTLE OF IRELAND.

DRUIDISM, the religion of the ancient Irish, was a cruel system. Its rites, celebrated in dark forests, included the offering of human sacrifices. The Druids taught orally, and never committed their precepts to writing. They inculcated the eternal transmigration of souls. Many of the weird superstitions of this early age were subsequently engrafted on the religion of the Gospel, and have maintained their hold on the vivid imagination of the peasantry down to the present

day.* But the Druids were not satisfied with gorgeous ceremonial and mystic rites. They taught arithmetic and botany, astronomy, music, and agriculture, and accordingly we find that letters were known to the Irish at a very early period. Thus Coelestius, a disciple of Pelagius,† wrote letters to his parents in Ireland, from which it would appear that some persons in the island must have been acquainted with literature.

In 431 Palladius arrived in the country. Prosper thus alludes to his mission: "Palladius is ordained by Pope Celestine, and sent as first bishop to the Scots believing in Christ." But the mission proved a failure. Europe was sunk in profound barbarism; the light of the Frankish Church burned dimly amid broils and constant wars. Then it was that God raised up in the West the first of that noble band of devoted missionaries, whose "sound went into all the earth and their words unto the end of the world." Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, was born about 372, some say in Scotland,‡ others in France. His father, Calphurnius, was a deacon—his grandfather, Potitus, a priest; his own name was Succath, which has been lost sight of in the Latin name Patricius. When about sixteen years of age, he was taken captive and sold as a slave to Milcho, the Pagan prince of Antrim, where for four, or as some say six, years, he tended the cattle of his master, and in privation, solitude, and secret intercourse with God, was gradually fitted for the great life-work which lay before him. That work now began to shape itself out in his lonely musings, and the poor slave resolved if ever he gained his freedom that he would devote himself to the task of preaching the Gospel to the Irish. How he escaped we know not, but he managed to cross into Gaul, where in spite of the entreaties of friends, and even of his parents, he set about qualifying himself for the arduous task of preaching the Gospel in Ireland.

He obtained holy orders from Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, and St. Martin, of Tours, and having spent some time in study, returned with a band of devoted companions to this country in A.D. 432, from which period he never ceased labouring for the conversion of the Irish until death closed his eventful career at the Abbey of Saul, March 17, 493.

When Patrick landed in Ireland the supreme authority was in the hands of Laogaire, son of Niall, of the Nine Hostages, who had succeeded Dathy in 427 or 428. In 433 the great national Parliament assembled at Tara at Easter, when St. Patrick pro-

* In the Irish MSS. of St. Paul's Epistles at Wurtzburg, the gloss on Jannes and Jambres (2 Tim. iii. 8) is *duo Druidae Aegyptiaci*.

† For an account of Coelestius, see Stokes' "Ireland and the Celtic Church," pp. 20-22.

‡ St. Patrick calls the place Benavem Taberniae. Dr. Petrie, following the authority of some ancient MSS., distinguishes between St. Patrick or Sen Patrick—Patrick the Elder—and Patrick Archbishop and Apostle. One died 492 or 493, the other 458 or 461. The one may have been identical with Palladius. King, l., p. 55.

Tirechan says that Palladius was also called Patrick, which doubtless led to many acts of one being attributed to the other, and may have been the origin of the Roman mission, attributed to St. Patrick. See Todd, "St. Patrick," Dublin, 1864, pp. 305-9; Petrie, "Essay on Tara Hill."

Compare Robertson, "History of the Christian Church," 3rd edition, London, 1864, l., p. 508, note; Gieseler, "Ecc. Hist.," Edinburgh, Clarke, 1848, II., p. 81, note, and the references in both cases; also "The Writings of St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland," by Rev. G. T. Stokes, D.D., and Rev. C. H. H. Wright, D.D., London, Nisbet & Co., 1887.

ceeded thither, and in the presence of the King, the Druids, and assembled princes, preached his message of the Gospel. The courage and earnestness of the missionaries produced a profound effect. Multitudes were converted, and according to some accounts Laogaire himself was baptised. This is, however, more than doubtful.*

Whether the King embraced Christianity or not, there can be no reasonable doubt that on one occasion at least St. Patrick made a bold effort for his conversion, and the story that he chose the occasion of the meeting of the National Parliament at Tara to carry his purpose into effect is quite in keeping with the customs of those early missionaries. In apostolic times the preacher began for the most part below, and worked upwards, leavening the mass of society from beneath. The slave—the outcast—the leper—the publican—the illiterate were first reached, and the leaven thus introduced permeated society till it pierced the hall of the noble, the porch of the philosopher, the palace of the king. In the mediæval times all this was reversed, the missionary began with the Chief, and the multitude followed the example of the leader. When the king became a Christian his nobles, priests, and people instantly followed his example. While this caused numerous conversions, it led to frightful evils, as men were often baptized without adequate instruction, and while nominally Christians remained really Pagans. Something of this kind took place in Ireland.

But so far as St. Patrick was concerned his whole anxiety evidently was to promote not nominal but true religion. Rejoicing himself in the knowledge of God, he desired to communicate that knowledge to others. Arrayed against him were the hosts of darkness; he went against them to Tara in the power of his God. Thus he says:—

I bind to myself to day
The Power of God to guide me,
The Might of God to uphold me,
The Wisdom of God to teach me,
The Eye of God to watch over me,
The Ear of God to hear me,
The Word of God to give me speech,
The Hand of God to protect me,
The Way of God to be before me,
The Shield of God to shelter me,
The Host of God to defend me
Against the Snares of Demons,
Against the temptations of vices,
Against the lusts of nature,
Against every man who meditates injury to me,
Whether far or near,
With few or with many.

I have set around me all these powers
Against every hostile savage power,
Directed against my body and my soul,
Against the incantations of false prophets,
Against the black laws of heathenism,
Against the false laws of heresy,
Against the deceit of idolatry,
Against the spells of women and smiths and druids,
Against all knowledge which blinds the soul of man.†

May Christ be with me, Christ before me,
Christ behind me, Christ within me,

Christ beneath me, Christ above me,
Christ at my right hand, Christ at my left hand,
Christ in the fort; Christ in the chariot seat; Christ in the poop;
May Christ be in the heart of every man who thinks of me,
Christ in the mouth of every man who speaks to me,
Christ in every eye that sees me,
Christ in every ear that hears me.

Such is the hymn known as "St. Patrick's Armour," through every line of which breathes the passionate adoration of a personal ever-present Saviour, which forms the keynote of this "the oldest monument of the Irish language now in existence."

Such a chant St. Paul might have composed when he confronted Nero and was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. John the Divine might have sung it as he looked out over the tossing sea from the lonely isle of Patmos, while in spirit he beheld the King in His beauty, and saw the land that is very far off.

Another remarkable document, bearing upon the life and labours of our Irish apostle, is St. Patrick's Confession, written by himself in Latin, at the close of his career. We learn from it that he was born in Armorie Gaul,* that clerical celibacy was not enforced in the Church in those days, that his own immediate ancestors were clerics, that in a vision he thought he heard voices from Ireland, crying, "We intreat thee, holy youth, to come and walk still among us." We find him in this confession fully recognising the authority of God's Word, and we do not find in it any recognition of the authority of the Bishop of Rome. The reference in the hymn, already quoted, to women, smiths, and druids is in keeping with the old ideas, attributing to such persons supernatural gifts.

In one place in the Confession he tells us that "the Irish, who had never before had the knowledge of God among them, and who had worshipped nothing but unclean idols down to that time, had become of late the Lord's people and the children of God.†

When St. Patrick and his companions had boldly made a stand for the truth at Tara, they proceeded into Connaught, where they were attended with the most marvellous success; thence they crossed through Meath, and entered Leinster. Alphin, king of Dublin, was converted, and the hamlet which marked the site of the modern capital of Ireland, was solemnly blessed by the great missionary, who advanced next into Munster to Cashel, where the king was converted and baptised. When the message of the Gospel had thus been delivered throughout the length and breadth of the island, the saint returned to Ulster and founded Armagh Cathedral, where, and at Sabhul Phadring he continued to reside until his death, March 17th, 493.‡

The early records of St. Patrick's life are free from any of those blundering attempts to make him out a missionary sent by Rome, which abound in later

* Scotland and France claim to have produced St. Patrick. Benavem Taberniae has by some been identified with Boulogne; others say Dumbarton on the Clyde; the passage in the Epistle to Coroticus, "To them it is a disgrace that we have been born in Ireland," proves nothing, as the writer evidently identifies himself with his converts of Irish birth.

† Compare King I., pp. 35-37. The principal events of St. Patrick's life are found in the "Hymn of Fiech, bishop of Sletty."

‡ Lanigan dates St. Patrick's death in A.D. 465, Wordsworth in 492, Robertson in 493, the Bollandists in 460. See Robertson, History of the Christian Church, London, 1876: Vol. I., Book iii., Chapter v., p. 257. Ussher dates his death in 493; Todd agrees with Ussher, and this date is borne out by the Annals of Ulster.

* Todd, "St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland," pp. 412-439.

† Todd's "St. Patrick," pp. 427, 428, 429; Killen, "Ecc. Hist. of Ireland," I., pp. 18, 19; King, "Church History of Ireland," I., pp. 40, 41, 42; Wordsworth, "Church of Ireland," pp. 20-22. Dr. Stokes, "Ireland and the Celtic Church," p. 86, gives an incident, in the missionary work of our apostle, that will repay perusal. Indeed, his whole book is a valuable contribution to Irish history.

histories of the apostle; they are also free from any of those spurious miracles attributed to the saint, which have made some writers question the whole account of the life and labours of St. Patrick. Stripped of the gaudy additions which superstition and a not unnatural veneration had added as the centuries rolled on, the simple story of the life of our Irish Patriarch is sufficiently attractive. A man of great zeal, intense devotion, burning love, strong faith, self denial, humility, and unwearied assiduity, the bead roll of Christian worthies holds no name deserving of higher honour than that of St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—Continuing the subject of my last letter, I observe that the difficulty of interpreting literally the first chapters of Genesis is no new thing. The latitude wanted was found chiefly in allegory. St. Paul allegorises. St. John provides abundant material for its scope. In Alexandria, Philo Judæus adopted the allegorical method with enthusiasm. He has no patience with literalism. It is "unreasonable, childish simplicity, derogatory to God as anthropomorphic." It is flat "impiety." "Unless we allegorise it is impossible to understand the story of Eden. The great school of Alexandrian divines followed his steps. Cardinal Cajetan and Erasmus were their followers in this path. Divines of the Middle Ages generally allowed four senses to the text of Scripture, of which allegory was one. Our Reformation divines, who hammered on the anvil of literalism, yet gave us this direction: "Read literally where you can, allegorise where you must." It is both scriptural and reasonable to read the first chapters of Genesis allegorically.

Now allegory may take history for its substratum (Gal. iv. 24), or it may take myth and tradition. These latter are often so deeply engrained in the popular mind, and withal so crude and repulsive, that in later times they demand the decency of an allegorical dress. The unclean thing may be purged away, as in Homer and the Neo-Platonists and the Rig Veda. What remains may be explained as a dramatic representation of nature, as with our modern philologists; or it may be made to serve a moral and a spiritual purpose. It is like exorcising the devil out of a man, clothing him and baptising him, instead of passing by on the other side. Genesis did this. It is not seen now for the first time. Spencer of Cambridge, two centuries ago, in an erudite work on Hebrew ritual, made the happy guess that "it was but an expurgated and so to speak divinely licensed adaptation of heathen customs at large." As far as the beginning of Genesis is concerned, he had only the meagre fragments of Damascius, Berosus, Philo of Byblus, etc., to guide him. He could not foresee the great Babylonian and Assyrian discoveries of our time, which have thrown a flood of light on one phase of that engrossing subject, the beginning of history. Let us see briefly what they tell us.

It is little short of marvellous. Ancient Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions and records deciphered, re-

vealing themselves and their language as comparatively modern, when compared with the far older Babylonian ones. The oldest of these Mr. Wallis Budge dates 3,800 B.C. But that is not all. These Assyrians and Babylonians are the descendants of Semitic ancestors, who, at some earlier but unknown date, conquered the basin of the Euphrates and Tigris. These invaders were called Chaldees, "conquerors." They were probably in a semi-barbarous condition. Not so the conquered Sumir-Accadians. They enjoyed a high state of civilisation, with cities, an established cult, libraries, and written traditions. Their civilisation must have rivalled that of Egypt in antiquity. It must have been very remote indeed. Assyriologists are satisfied that the conquering Semites adopted the civilisation and arts of the natives, and with it their mythology with little alteration. A triad of moon goddesses appears to have been the chief addition to the Accadian cultus. From whatever country these invaders came—Arabia is considered their most probable home—they did not bring with them the traditions which appear in Genesis and other Semitic cosmogonies, but they adopted them from the more literate race which they subjugated and incorporated. The point is worth noticing, for, if correct, it assigns to an alien people what we have hitherto considered purely Semitic traditions.

Now the proper names which occur in the opening chapters of Genesis, as far as they have been deciphered, belong to the valley of the Euphrates and to no other country, certainly not to Arabia. Adamu, "Adam," Ablu, "Abel," Idiglat, "Hiddekel," are Babylonian words. So are "cherub," and Eden "the field" of Babylonia. The site of Eden is no longer doubtful. It is not in Cashmere (C. J. Stone), nor westward of the Beloot Tagh (C. F. Keary), but in Babylonia. Pishon signifies "canal"; Gihon may be the Accadian Gukhan (A. H. Sayce). The river Euphrates is the Babylonian Puratu. It is also represented by characters which give it the meaning of "the river of canals." The revolving sword of the Chaldæo-Assyrian Kirūb is a Babylonian conception. Babel of course is the Babylonian Bābīlu, but it no longer means confusion, but "the gate of God." Every year is adding its quota to the conviction that the early Biblical localities and proper names are Babylonian.

Again, it cannot be doubted that the Elohist and Jehovist, whose documents are blended in Genesis, were acquainted with and made use of the written traditions of Babylonia. They follow fairly closely the recovered Accadian account of the Deluge in the great poem of Uruk. As in Genesis, the Accadian Noah is saved on account of his piety, while the rest of mankind are drowned as a punishment for their sins. The account of the creation, to "the very wording and phrases of Genesis" (A. H. Sayce), resembles the Assyrian account. There is also a great similarity of narrative in the legend of the Tower of Babel, even to the use of the word "confounding" their speech, found in Genesis and in the Assyrian text. Owing, doubtless, to the fragmentary state of the brick literature as yet found, the story of the Temptation and the Fall does not appear. Still, the Accadians knew of a wicked serpent of night or darkness, which had brought about the Fall of man, (A. H. Sayce). They had a consciousness of sin and its deserved punishment. "Let the doer of sin bear his sin, let the doer of wickedness bear his wickedness.

May the faithful not be destroyed!" (Deluge Poem.) From ancient Egypt, Iran and India the same testimony comes, that "the discovery of conscience" was not exclusively Semitic.

The conclusion forced upon us by the above considerations is obvious. The early chapters of Genesis are not a free record of divine revelation to a favoured race, but an adaptation of the national legends of the old Accadians, running back to an untold age, venerable for their antiquity and celebrated in their great cosmical epic. Like Homer's later poems, they would naturally embody myth and tradition. The Deluge, *e.g.*, would be a venerable tradition, but the forming man out of the ground, the talking serpent, the curse of the ground and the confusion of tongues, &c., would be myths. The idea of primeval man made of earth or mud is so natural to savages that it is no wonder that it is found, with variations, all over the globe. All sorts of myths exist on the subject, and had the Bible chosen any other mode of creation, it is probable that it would have found some scattered traditions to endorse it. As for the talking serpent, examples of accredited metamorphosis are common everywhere. Human tigers, hyenas, wolves, etc., abound. The dingo talks at times in Australia, and the blacks, very properly, run away. In Peru the devil appeared and "spoke in the form of a tiger, very fierce." In the Levant a stag spoke once, "by Allah's will." Bushmen assert that lions talk like men, "by putting their tails into their mouths." These instances could be multiplied. The idea forms an irrational element in myths. The other idea of things being changed by a curse is also mythical. Apollo cursed the crow once, and, from being white, it became for ever black. Among the Namaquas of Africa, the divine or heroic being, Heitsi Eibib, cursed the hare, "and the hare ran away and is still running." He cursed the lion and bade him walk on the ground, so the king of beasts left off building nests up a tree. The notion belongs to the age of the medicine man and rain maker, with their accredited supernatural power. No philologist accounts for the great divisions and subdivisions of human language by the myth of the tower of Babel.

In conclusion, the recent discoveries in the land of the Two Rivers, by revealing to us the real sources of Genesis in Accadian legend and myth, and by giving us a glimpse of their remote antiquity, indirectly support the Evolution theory. They remove the obstacle of direct Mosaic revelation, and exhibit unpremeditated agreement with what has been surmised from other investigations on the antiquity of the human race. As for Genesis itself, its simplicity and dignity, its moral and spiritual inspiration and power, and its grand Monotheism, amidst tangled mythologies and often obscene heathen cosmogonies, stamp it, after all deductions, as a noble prelude to the noblest and most venerable Book of the world.

F. T. P.

THE KILDARE PROTEUS.

SIR,—The controversy which has been for some time carried on in the PULPIT between Mr. Lawrence and his many-aliased antagonist seems to me to have a useful moral for many of us, in the vivid illustrations it affords of the way in which a fixed idea may gain such despotic possession of a mind otherwise tolerably acute, as to render it impervious to reason and

blind to facts. Theological polemics are full of warnings of the same kind, and show us the danger of narrowness and one-sidedness; of dwelling on some one point till it fills the whole field of vision; of insisting on some one formula till words lose their meaning for us, and we fail to understand the plainest statements or arguments which propound another side of the truth.

In the present instance the case seems to lie in a nutshell. The Anglican Catechism calls the outward and visible sign in a sacrament a means whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace; and applying this to the Lord's Supper it follows that bread and wine are a means whereby we receive the Body and Blood of Christ. The Anglican Article, guarding the doctrine against a materialistic interpretation, says that "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith."

Now the Synod of the Church of Ireland, in the use of its lawful right, judged it advisable to bring this safeguard against Materialism from the Article where few see it, to the Catechism, where all would learn it; and accordingly a new question and answer were introduced into the Catechism, giving the limitation in the very words of the Article. To any one who received both Catechism and Article honestly it is difficult to see how this could be objectionable in regard of doctrine, even if the change were thought inconvenient or unnecessary.

Yet Mr. Lawrence's opponent—I do not know by which of his many names I ought to designate him—having, I suppose, some grudge against the Synod of his Church, makes this little change the occasion of vilifying his Church before the world, and paradoxically maintains, with tedious reiteration, that doctrine which is orthodox in the Article is heretical in the Catechism!

It is instructive to observe the reasoning, if the word is applicable here, by which this paradox is supported. If not forcible, it is happily short; for it is just this: If faith is the mean whereby Christ's Body is received in the Supper, then bread as the outward vehicle, the priest as the giver of the bread, and the whole Supper itself, become superfluous! In other words the reception of Christ *in the Supper* by faith means the reception of Christ *without any Supper at all!* And so the Synod is charged by this loyal son of his Church with aiming at getting rid of the Supper and the priest, because it endorses the statement of the Article, that the mean whereby Christ is received *in the Supper* is faith.

It is in vain that Mr. Lawrence has pointed out that there is no real contradiction in saying that the outward and visible sign is a means whereby the inward and spiritual grace is received, and on the other hand that faith is the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received; and that whatever apparent opposition there may be in the two statements, it is not of the Synod's making, but is embedded in the Anglican formularies. His opponent is so tyrannised over by his fixed idea, as to be unable to discriminate between the material vehicle by which the grace comes, and the action of the soul through which the grace is received and appropriated. He insists on making nonsense by a ridiculous interpretation, and then charges the nonsense on his opponents as if it were theirs and not his own. Yet surely Mr. Lawrence's distinction needs no intellectual effort for its comprehension!

Suppose I illustrate it. A homœopath pretends to

administer a portion of medicine so minute as to be invisible, impalpable—as intangible as a metaphysical abstraction. To offer it to his patient he needs a vehicle for its conveyance, and employs a globule of sugar of milk in which it is supposed to be infused; this globule is then the means, the instrument, the vehicle, by which the patient receives the medicine from the practitioner. But he has to receive it in another sense—to take, use, appropriate it. But how? Medicines may be swallowed, or injected, or rubbed on the surface; these are so many different modes of receiving them into the system. In the case of the globule, it is to be received by the mouth, not by injection, nor by surface-rubbing, but by swallowing. In one sense the sugar of milk is the means of its reception; in another sense the mouth or the act of swallowing. Apply the distinction to the Eucharist. There is a spiritual grace to be received by the spirit of man. The bread and wine are the outward means through which it is offered, the vehicles by which it is received. But it reaches and enters into the human spirit only by the appropriate action of that spirit towards it, and that action is faith. Speaking of the sacramental presentation of the grace it is by means of the outward signs of bread and wine. Speaking of the inward and spiritual reception of the grace, it is by faith alone. Faith is the receptive act of the believing soul.

Allow me, Sir, before I conclude, to question the morality of a controversialist writing under various aliases in support of himself, and thereby creating the impression that a number of independent writers have come forward to maintain his thesis. Fortunately, to arrange the drapery of style so as to hide the cloven foot is extremely difficult; but that does not make the attempt less reprehensible. A many-headed monster may be tolerable in an apocalyptic writing, where it deceives nobody; but in honest discussion the less we have of many-headed correspondents who surpass Cerberus in plurality, and pose as half-a-dozen gentlemen in one, the better it certainly will be.

PRESBYTER.

SIR,—Your correspondent “Inquirens” objects to the distinction that I attempt to make between the employment, in the divine institution of the Eucharist, of the elements as the means whereby spiritual grace is conveyed, and of faith as the mean by which the Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful. The distinction is not mine, it is made in the Catechism and in the 28th Article. I do no more than point out, that to speak of the means in the one case, and of the mean in the other, is speaking of two different things; one of giving, and the other of receiving and appropriating. The new question and answer in our Irish Catechism have fallen into no error. Any one who maintains that they have impeaches the Article from whence they are derived.

Your other correspondent, the writer of the pretended *éloge* on the late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, objects to what I said in my letter dated 24th ult. He says that Johnson (Dictionary) says that “a vehicle is a means by which anything is conveyed.” A few lines farther on he says that Johnson says a means is a vehicle. Dr. Johnson says neither one nor the other. He defines vehicle, “that by means of which anything is conveyed.” Your correspondent says that the Report of Master Brooke’s Committee

was in effect adopted by our Synod. There is only one way in which a report of a committee can be adopted by the body to which it is presented, that is, by resolution; and that Report was not adopted by resolution. A recommendation contained in it was carried out, some years after the Report was presented. This was no adoption either of the Report or of the matter contained in it. Your correspondent says that the reasoning of the Report is heretical. No doubt he thinks it is, or he would not say so; but his thinking so does not make it so. The imputation is ridiculous.

He says that I quote the Catechism mistakenly. I do not; I quote the new answer, the very thing that I write about. He goes on to say:—“It (the Catechism) says that the bread and wine are the means, but that only the faithful are partakers of Christ, though others eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.” The Catechism does not contain this. There is no occasion for me to make any further remarks on the letter of a person who can quote neither Dr. Johnson’s Dictionary nor the Church Catechism correctly.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

7th April, 1888.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND DR. LITTLEDALE.

SIR,—Recent numbers of the PULPIT contain letters with different signatures, but evidently by the same hand, the style being easy to recognise, attacking Dr. Littledale’s “Words for Truth.” In the first of these letters the writer represents Dr. Littledale as saying: “This is the Anglican doctrine, that they, the accidents (of the elements in the Eucharist) remain in their very natural substances.” Dr. Littledale does not say this; your correspondent has interpolated the words “the accidents” into the quotation; they are not in the text. In the other letter, signed “An Afflicted Relative,” there is “Dr. Littledale’s assertion, ‘that what the Black Rubric says is that the appearances alone remain, the substances having vanished;’ this is the most astounding misstatement that I have ever seen”—there is a misstatement, but it is made by your correspondent, who gives the above in inverted commas, as from Dr. Littledale, in whose book there are no such words, nor anything like them.

In fact, the writer of the letters does not understand what he is writing about. He speaks of phantom and accident as if they are the same. He plainly thinks that the doctrine of Transubstantiation and the Romish doctrine of the Mass are the same thing. He appears ignorant that the former rests on a metaphysical notion about substance, prevalent during the middle ages, and now exploded, although the middle age terminology is not altogether given up. He accuses Dr. Littledale of making a muddle, which he makes himself.

If I mistake not, your correspondent is the same who, under the signature “Even-handed Justice,” a few weeks ago informed your readers that he, and some persons unnamed, whom he calls “we,” are the only honest people in the Church of Ireland. If his honesty permits him to make false quotations from books, it is a thing that will not be appreciated.

B.

30th March, 1888.

THE Bishop of Llandaff has fixed the following places and dates for holding his next triennial Visitation:—Wednesday, May 23, Llandaff; Friday 25, Cowbridge; Saturday, 26, Neath; Monday, 28, Newport; Tuesday, 29, Abergavenny; Friday, June 1, Monmouth.

WE learn that the Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A., for many years one of the Cowley Fathers, and a well-known ritualistic preacher, was received into the Roman Catholic Church at Rome on Easter Eve. Mr. Rivington took a Third Class at Oxford in 1859. —*Morning Post*.

THE Rev. George Bond, rector of Farnworth, near Warrington, against whom a *prima facie* case was established in reference to charges of inebriety by his parishioners, has placed himself unreservedly in the hands of the Bishop of Liverpool, who will next week make known his decision.

IN compliance with a petition, signed by Sir Frederick Ouseley, Dr. Cowen, Dr. Stainer, Dr. Martin, Signor Randegger, Mr. Turpin, Mr. Prout, and other distinguished musicians and persons of eminence, the Archbishop of Canterbury has conferred the degree of Mus. Doc. upon Mr. William Lemare, for many years principal of the Surrey County School of Music.

THE Bishop of Ripon was announced to preach at the reopening service at the parish church, Sheffield, on Thursday evening, and a great congregation assembled to hear him, but Archdeacon Blakeney received a letter from Mrs. Boyd Carpenter, stating that owing to severe indisposition, brought about by over-work, his lordship's medical adviser had forbidden his leaving home.

THE *Yorkshire Post* says there was a disgraceful scene at the close of the services at St. James's, Barnoldswick, on Sunday night. The Rev. John Woods refused to give up the offertories to be counted. The churchwardens demanded a count in the vestry. The vicar stood against the door, and Mr. Briggs, a warden, in attempting to open it, was seized behind. Briggs then seized the vicar, and tore the cape off his invernass coat. The wardens were then ejected with great violence, a quarryman named Brooks threatening to pitch the sidesman into the street.

BURIAL REFORM ASSOCIATION. — Last week, a Conference was held in the Council Chamber, Hull, under the auspices of the above named society, in which Canon McCormick, Vicar of Hull, the Medical Officer of Health, the Chairman of the Sanitary Committee, the Chairman of the Hull Trades' Union, and many others took part. Speaking at Manchester, the Hon. Secretary said that the Association was endeavouring to impress upon the public that the only mode of burying the dead, consistent with the health of the living, was that which enables the body as quickly as possible to be brought into contact with the earth and air, and its decomposition and absorption effected. The Society urged taking every precaution in the interests of the living, instead of paying inordinate regard to the mortal remains, discouraged the use of a pall which readily carries disease from place to place, deprecated carrying into Church the remains of one who had died of infectious disease, recommended the use of properly prepared earth for the destruction of virulent infectious germs, and strongly opposed the use of durable coffins. It was stated that the "Disposal of the Dead" is one of the subjects selected for discussion by the Church Congress in October.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Beechey, Rev. Canon St. Vincent, Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Norfolk (Major Stocks).
 Chapman, Rev. D. M. B., M.A., Vicar of Wambrook, Chard; Vicar of St. Mark's, Preston.
 Cowburn, Rev. Robert, Curate-in-Charge of St. Luke's District in St. Matthew's, Chadderton. Oldham; Rector of Moorby and Vicar of Wood Enderby, Boston, Lincolnshire.
 Crowden, Rev. Dr., Head Master of Cranbrook School; Head Master of Eastbourne College.
 Currie, Rev. H. P., M.A., Principal of Dorchester Missionary College; Principal of St. Stephen's House, Oxford.
 Deane, Rev. Prebendary Arthur Mackreth, M.A., Rector of East Marden, Chichester.
 Evans, Rev. Enoch James, M.A., Vicar-Choral of St. Asaph Cathedral.
 Foster, Rev. Arthur Wellesley, M.A., Rector of Tatham, Lancaster.
 Gasking, Rev. Samuel, Assistant-Chaplain to Emigrants in the City and Diocese of Liverpool.
 Graham, Rev. Henry Longueville, M.A., Vicar of Riseley Vicarage, Beds.
 Hicks, Rev. W. M., late Curate of St. John's, Lytham; English Chaplain at Rummelsburg, near Berlin.
 Hotham, Rev. F. W., Rector of Cricket Malherbie, near Chard.
 Howell, Rev. Thomas Twiss, M.A., Rector of Arncliffe, near Doncaster.
 James, Rev. H. L., Vicar of Walderswick-cum-Blythborough, Suffolk; Vicar of St. Cuthbert's, Everton, Liverpool.
 Johnson, Rev. E. J. F., M.A., Vicar of Hillesley, Gloucestershire.
 Longstaff, Rev. T., Curate-in-Charge of St. Aldate's, Gloucestershire.
 Munn, Rev. Joseph Shepherd, Assistant Curate of St. Mark's, New Ferry, Bebington.
 Newton, Rev. W. F., M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Preston; Vicar of Wambrook, Chard, Somersetshire.
 Noblet, Rev. W., Curate of the Parish Church, Bradford; Vicar of Wilsden, near Bingley, Yorkshire.
 Owen, Rev. Charles Harry, M.A., Rector of Bradfield, Berkshire; Rector of Adel, Leeds.
 Palmer, Rev. James Nelson, M.A., Rector of Yaverland, Isle of Wight.
 Powys, Rev. and Hon. Edward Victor, Rector of Warrington.
 Robinson, Rev. E. C., Vicar of Croxton Kerial, Grantham.
 Sheppard, Rev. S., Curate of Deane; Vicar of Wingates, Bolton.
 Skelton, Rev. C. A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Leeds; Chaplain to the Surrey County Asylum, Brookwood.
 Standige, Rev. Arthur, B.A., Rector of Adel, Leeds; Rector of Bradfield, Berkshire.
 Stone, Rev. D., M.A., Vice-Principal of Dorchester Missionary College; Principal of Dorchester Missionary College.
 Strickland, Rev. William James, M.A., Vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist, East Dulwich.
 Sutthery, Rev. W. Stanley, Vicar of St. Thomas's, Leeds.
 Taylor, Rev. Frederick Herbert, Precentor of the Cathedral, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Succentor of Ripon Cathedral.
 Whistler, Rev. Charles Watts, Chaplain of the Hastings Fishermen's Church; Vicar of Theddlethorpe All Saints', Lough.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Baylis, Rev. Edward, M.A., the Rector, at Slough Rectory, on 8th inst., aged 72.
 Edwards, Rev. Lawrence Tucker, formerly Rector of Pitsea, Essex, at Driefontein, South Africa, on Feb. 26, aged 81.
 Hayes, Rev. Robert, Vicar of Woodhouse, Leicestershire, on the 7th inst., aged 49.
 Loxley, Rev. Arthur Smart, at Fairford Vicarage, on the 2nd inst., aged 41.
 Palmes, Rev. William Lindsay, of Naburn Hall, Yorks, on Easter Day, aged 74.
 Sheppard, Rev. Thomas Henry, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, at Canterbury, on the 9th inst., aged 73.
 Taylor, Rev. Robert Mitford, for nearly forty-five years Vicar of the parish, J.P. for the East Riding, at Hunmanby Vicarage, Yorkshire, on the 1st inst., aged 77.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE FUTURE STATE INDICATED BY THE RESURRECTION OF BODY.

BY THE REV. L. R. RAWNSLEY, B.A., CURATE OF CROSS STONE, TODMORDEN.

SERMON PREACHED ON SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY, JANUARY 29TH, 1888.

"Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."—ROMANS viii. 23.

YOU probably noticed, brethren, that our first lesson this morning set forth how "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," while the second lesson fixed our thoughts on the new heaven and the new earth. It would be impossible for any thinking being to carefully consider what is actually meant by the creation of the world, that is to say, the designing, fabricating, and regulating the sun, moon and stars; things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; the calling into existence of vegetable and animal life, and the changeless legislation which brings that life from its primal germ to mature growth; and then to decadence and corruption, as well as providing for the dissemination of plants and the propagation of animate beings—it is impossible, I say, for any one to consider what is meant by creation, and to think of the intricacies of geology, astronomy, botany, anatomy, and of other multiple sciences, without standing awestruck at sight of so much that is incomprehensible, and so clearly the result of infinite knowledge and omnipotence, and asking with Job: "What is man that thou shouldest magnify him, and that thou shouldest set thine heart upon him"? or saying with David, "When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; what is man, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him"? It is therefore usual on Septuagesima Sunday for your preachers to endeavour to engage your attention while they discourse on some theme closely connected with the beginning, or the end of the world. Last year we were bidden to contemplate the suitability, from a Christian standpoint, of the opening words of the Book of Genesis, the oldest book in the world, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This morning I wish rather to consider the grounds on which we hope that our bodies will participate in the new heavens and the new earth; the destiny that there awaits us, the natural forces which will be concerned in the

destruction of the world, and the part which these forces may take in the resurrection of the body; and lastly, to ask your earnest meditation on the possibility of our treatment of the natural body affecting for eternity the spiritual body. On some of these points I shall not speak authoritatively, but direct you to certain suggestions of analogy, and leave to your future contemplation the rationality of these speculations.

My text speaks of us as "waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." These words are remarkable, as being, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the only words in the Bible which speak of the Christian's adoption to be a Son of God, as something expected, rather than attained. Even in the previous verses of this same chapter, the Romans are told that they "have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father," and that "the Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." St. John also writes: "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God." The real signification of my text would appear to be that at present our adoption is incomplete; that we have only received the first-fruits of the spirit of adoption, whose complete and entire bestowal is postponed until the redemption of our body. This interpretation is confirmed by a glance at 2 Cor. v. 5, where St. Paul, after telling how we shall be clothed upon with our new body, says: "Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit." These two verses taken together teach the full extent of our adoption, the present guarantee of its certainty, and the announcement that the creation of our bodies was due to this very object in the mind of the Creator. Mark how analogy supports this latter statement. A human artificer intends those works whose construction has brought him most distinction to be lasting and prized. May we not, therefore, say, regard being had to St. Paul's teaching, that there is an improbability that God should have intended, that

Man, his last work, who seemed so fair,

Such splendid purpose in his eyes,

Who rolled the psalm to wintry skies,

Who built him fanes of fruitless prayer;

Fruitless the prayers would be if life ended here.

Who loved, who suffered countless ills,

Who battled for the true, the just,

Be blown about the desert dust

Or sealed within the iron hills?

Is there not an antecedent probability as Isaiah xxvi. 19, says: "The dead men shall live; together with my dead body shall they arise"? that, in the words contained in Daniel's last chapter, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt"? Are we not naturally disposed to accept as true Christ's revelation, St. John v. 28: "The hour is coming, in

which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation?"

Let us now advance one step further, and ask what will be the nature of the new body. St. Paul thus writes to the Corinthians, after saying that the new body will arise from the present body, as a plant arises from seed: "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body."

The new body will be incorruptible. There will be no failing of physical or mental strength. The eyes will not grow dim, the ears will not become dull of hearing, there will be no loss of vital power, no decay of energy, no decrease in activity, or in mental power. Here in this corruptible body age gradually deprives us of our senses, and weakens our mental power, often leaving men "in second childhood and mere oblivion." In the new world the incorruptible body will be, from its very nature, free from all consuming agencies which wear away a corruptible body.

"It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory." What a contrast. We are compelled to lay reverently in the grave the beloved form from which the soul has fled. We cannot cherish the lifeless body. The day will come when the archangel's trump will sound, and that body will be raised in glory to be loved by us as we hope through the endless years of eternity, neither need we think only of the bodies of others. It is good for us to think of our own bodies, as they will be, when sown in dishonour, no longer useful, no longer prized by mortal folk; and as they will be, when raised in glory, immortal and incorruptible. Between the last conscious act of this body, and the first conscious act of the new body, what a contrast, what a change!

"It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power." There is something appalling in the sight of a lifeless body; something which, were it not for Christian hopes, might well strike terror into the heart of the bravest, and cause the most confident to despair. There is such a sense of weakness in the contemplation of death, which startles us when we remember that we too must die. Thus in Tennyson's "Two Voices," to the voice that believed in a future state.

Consider well, the voice replied,
His face that two hours since hath died.
Wilt thou find passion, pain, or pride?
Will he obey when one commands?
Or answer should one press his hands?
He answers not, nor understands.
His palms are folded on his breast,
There is no other thing expressed
But long disquiet merged in rest.

Notwithstanding these thoughts suggested by the evil voice, there comes to us another and an

holier voice, the voice of revelation saying, "it is raised in power," and new thoughts of future greatness dispel the fears caused by a knowledge of our present weakness.

"It is raised in power." It has occurred to me that these words may furnish a clue to what has often puzzled us, namely, how we shall be able in their glorified bodies to recognise those whom we here knew in bodies marred by deformity, illness, or age. It is not difficult to imagine that in the spiritual body the senses will be more powerful than in the natural body; and that the spiritual vision will discern readily what the natural vision would not at once recognise, and that accordingly we shall trace, and trace instinctively, the glorified forms of those we loved on earth.

Advancing yet another step in our inquiry, let us examine what will be the destiny of our bodies in the new heaven and the new earth, and try and discern what the true nature of Scripture teaching is on this subject. In handling this subject I shall first state what is positive, and generally agreed upon, and then discuss passages which are not universally accepted as referring to this question. I have already referred you to the words of Daniel, "Some shall awake to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt": and to the words of Christ "They shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation, *i.e.*, of judgment, as you will see by a reference to the Revised Version. St. Paul, in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, declares that God "will render unto every man according to his deeds. To them, who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath; tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, but glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good." To the Corinthians in his second epistle, the fifth chapter and the tenth verse, he says: "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad." Such quotations should be sufficient to teach us that we shall be judged hereafter according to our deeds, and that our future condition depends on our conduct in this life. The language is plain, free from metaphor, and given directly, and not under the form of a parable: also, in these three passages there is no mention of any punishment by fire. I will now refer to some passages supposed to teach that doctrine.

In an address which was recently read to me, the author quoted the 33rd chapter of Isaiah and the 14th verse: "Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings"? as a text which it was impossible for those who opposed his theory to

get over. It is one thing to see the verse away from its context, and the other to see it with it. The question is supposed to be put by the sinners of Sion, when they are being "as the burnings of lime," "as thorns cut down that are burned in the fire." But what is the answer to this question. "Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" It is an answer which will surprise those who have taken this text to refer to everlasting punishment. This is the answer: "He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly, he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil." Then follows the reason why this man is safe. "He shall dwell on high: his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks: bread shall be given him, his water shall be sure." The fact is, my brethren, that this 33rd chapter of Isaiah, is a poetical description of God's judgments on sinners, and His protection of the godly. In the eleventh verse of this chapter we read, "Ye shall conceive chaff; ye shall bring forth stubble, your breath as a fire shall consume you." It would be as absurd to take the first two sentences of this verse as real, as it is to take the latter sentence as real. They are all metaphorical.

Again, in Revelations xix. and xx., a lake of fire is mentioned, but even then all the followers of the beast are not cast into it; for, though this fate is distinctly said to befall some, others are said to be killed with the sword, and to be left as a prey to the birds of the air. The Book of Revelation is full of imagery. The seven churches are represented by a candlestick with seven branches. Christ is spoken of as the Morning Star, and as the Lamb, and the Church is portrayed as the Lamb's bride. In the twenty-first chapter it is stated that murderers, fornicators, sorcerers, and idolaters shall have their part in the lake of fire. In the twenty-second chapter it is stated that such people are to be outside the gates of the New Jerusalem. Thus our Lord sometimes speaks of sinners going into everlasting fire, sometimes as "being cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth." This would lead us to suppose that Christ sometimes adopted, as typical of the place of punishment, the Rabbinical legend of the lake of fire, or Gehenna, *i.e.*, the valley of Hinnom, the place where parents made their children pass through the flames to Moloch, and where the dead bodies of criminals were cast. Thus, in the last chapter of Isaiah and the last verse we read, after it has been foretold that all flesh shall come and worship before the Lord, "They shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against Me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched." This verse is thrice, and only thrice quoted in the New Testament, and then on the same occasion. Thus, in Mark ix., 43-48, men are told that it is better to part with an

offending hand, foot, or eye, rather than that the whole body should be cast into hell, into unquenchable fire, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. The word which Christ used, "Gehenna," as you will find in the margins of your Revised Versions, would make His meaning clear to the Jew. It is better to live, though maimed, halt or one eyed, than to be put to death as a criminal for offences committed through the members of the body; just as in the previous verse He states it is better to be drowned in the depths of the sea than to cause a little one who believes in Christ to stumble.

Some of you may be asking how I explain the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. I reply that Christ adopted Jewish phraseology in both parts of the parable. Lazarus is in Abraham's bosom; that to a Jew would mean the place of rest; the rich man is in Hades, not Gehenna, tormented with flame; this to a Jew would mean the place of the lost. While, however, I thus explain the above passages, there are two which I cannot so explain. Both in the parable of the tares and the parable of the drag-net it is stated that the wicked shall be cast into the furnace of fire; and again in the twenty-sixth chapter of St. Matthew we are told that Christ will say to those on His left hand, who have not helped the unfortunate, "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." In neither of these passages is it stated that the lost are to endure the pains of burning; and if they will have to exist in fire, science would teach us that in time their bodies will accommodate themselves to the conditions under which existence is supported; for that the bad are not annihilated, but live for ever, is sufficiently taught by the words, "these shall go away into everlasting punishment." The punishment would not be everlasting if it were annihilation.

I would next invite your consideration to the part which natural forces will take in the destruction of the world, and the part which these forces may take in the resurrection of the body. Christ has told us "the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken." St. Peter has told us "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned." These declarations of Holy Writ coincide with the way in which science teaches that the world could be dissolved. Sometimes we are startled with news of a great earthquake, a volcanic eruption, mighty hurricane or flood. Only last autumn a large river in China burst its banks, and is said to have destroyed lives estimated at over a million. May it not be that the partial devastation caused by these forces of nature, forces which science can neither explain nor foretell, is a

warning to us of the general destruction of the universe which will take place at the end of all things, and may probably be effected by the combined action of hurricane, flood, fire and earthquake. Commending such thoughts to your further inquiry, I now invite your attention to this question: How may these forces effect the resurrection of the body? We are told that the change will take place "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," and it appears to our limited experience that no number of years would suffice to produce the new body from the seed of the old body. I offer the following idea for your consideration. Admitted that the present body may contain the seed of a new body, is it not probable that this seed could only be made productive by being brought in contact with very great heat? With all reverence, be it said, may we not imagine that heat may play the same part in the bringing the new body into existence that the heat of a greenhouse plays in forcing plants or vegetables? Can we not suppose that the force of the mighty earthquakes which will dissolve this world will rend open all graves and tombs, while the force of mighty hurricanes will snatch up the bodies to meet the Lord in the air? These are points of speculation, but I am inclined to believe that, with regard to both the destruction of the world and the resurrection of the body, God will work through those mighty forces of nature, which obey Him and Him alone.

And finally, my brethren, who are waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body, pause and reflect how your treatment of this present corruptible body may operate on the future incorruptible body. I feel inclined myself, though this is a matter of speculation, to suppose that the different degrees of happiness or of woe through eternity may be largely traced to the individual nature of each new body. It is a general principle in nature, "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." We also know that there will be a vast difference in plants grown from seeds taken from a well-kept garden, and from a neglected garden. The former will be more beautiful and more healthy than the latter. Apply this rule to our lives. Is it not likely that new bodies will not only in their physical, but also in their mental powers be affected by our conduct of the present body? Is it contrary to analogy to suppose that those who spend their time in drunkenness and debauchery will be spoiling that seed from which the new body will be formed? Physiology teaches us that the mind grows in the way in which it is habitually used; that the mental organism first has to be built up; that it is then being continually re-constructed, but that when it has come to full maturity it requires to be maintained. Is it not reasonable, therefore, to suppose that, as we now habitually use our mind, and as we maintain it after the period of re-construction is complete, so it will be in the new body? What eternity of punishment could more

convey to our conscience a knowledge of its guilt and the justice of its doom than the discernment that we were for ever what we had made ourselves by our own conduct? that he that is unjust must be unjust still; that he which is filthy must be filthy still; while he that is righteous must be righteous still, and he that is holy, holy still?

My brethren, it is time for me to conclude, and to request you to think over the suggestions I have placed before you. No one believes that our future state will depend on life spent here more than myself; that there will be tribulation and anguish to every soul of man that worketh evil, but glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good. I am even inclined by analogy to believe in everlasting punishment, but I do not believe in everlasting torture, nor in a state of punishment unalleviated by any joy. Are there not certain punishments that last through men's mortal lives? A man squanders a fortune, and consequently has to toil for daily bread through the rest of his life. Still in that life come the happy days, but there is ever the reflection of that state from which he has fallen, and which he has lost through his own fault. A boy wastes his time at school, and thus fails to pass his examination into the army. He accordingly is forced, as in cases known to myself, to emigrate and learn farming. He has through his own wasted opportunities failed to enter a profession on which his heart was set, but even this regret does not deny him all pleasures. So I believe that those who squander here God's gifts of health, reason, or affection, as well as those who will not prepare themselves for that kingdom which they hope to enter, will reap the penalty, and an eternal penalty perhaps, hereafter, if not here; but the Bible does not teach that eternal punishment is a state of eternal misery. "Be sure your sin will find you out." Sometimes it will find you out in this world; at other times it may not find you out till hereafter; but, accepting the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, natural science and physiology would both warn us that it is extremely likely that we make our future state of weal or woe by our own actions, and if the new body is incorruptible, that state must be eternal. If we who are waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body, could only think what that redemption may imply, and how we may really be now deciding our own eternal lives, we should pray that we may glorify God in our body, and present our body a living sacrifice unto God. For my own part, I am strongly of the opinion expressed by Longfellow, that

No action whether foul or fair
Is ever done, but it leaves somewhere
A record, written by fingers ghostly,
As a blessing or a curse; and mostly
In the greater weakness, or greater strength
Of the acts which follow it, till at length
The wrongs of ages are redressed,
And the justice of God made manifest.

Certain **HARNESS' Cure.**
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
 FOR
LADIES' AILMENTS
 Mrs. CRAWSHAW, 3, Princes' Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W., writes:—"After a fortnight's application of *Harness' Electropathic Appliances* the effect has been truly marvellous. For eight months my life was a terrible burden. I am now quite well again."
 Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application to Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, the Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
 On 3 Address,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
 (Corner of Rathbone Place.)
 Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 1888.

MORE BISHOPS?

IT is a curious coincidence that on the completion of Mr. Cross's scheme for increasing the Home Episcopate by the appointment of Bishop Walsham How to Wakefield, a meeting of Surrey Churchmen should have been called to consider whether something could not be done to relieve the Bishop of Rochester from the heavy strain which a diocese like his, comprising all South London and its tributary suburban districts, entails upon his Lordship. A further meeting has been held, and it is now left for the Archbishop to say whether a new see for the county of Surrey shall be formed. This opens out another and wider question: Are we to go on sub-dividing bishoprics in the same way that old parishes have been sub-divided, in order to keep up with the increase of population? There are now thirty-three bishops, twenty-four in the Southern Province and nine in the Northern, or when Dr. How shall have been enthroned at Wakefield, ten; making in all thirty-four. But when we look at some of the dioceses, we find that they are of immense size; take, for instance, the Diocese of York, which from its Southern to its Northernmost point is one hundred miles long, and comprises the whole of the East Riding with portions of the North and West Ridings, with the result that several of the clergy know very little about the diocesan. So again, take the Diocese of Winchester, which comprises Hampshire, a portion of Surrey, the Isle of Wight, and the Channel Islands; and until the time of Bishop Sumner, the clergy in the Channel Islands scarcely ever received a visit from their Bishops.

In former days the Channel Islands belonged to the See of Coutances; but when we lost our possessions in France, they were added to the Diocese of Winchester, the transfer taking place in the year 1568. Such being the case, we cannot see any reason why they should not be again separated and made into a distinct diocese, just the same as Sodor and Man. And there are other portions of the episcopate, which, if we act on the principle of sub-division because of over-population, should be further sub-divided. There is, however, one great difficulty which so far, prevents any rapid progress in this direction, and that is the question of "ways and means." According to the plan laid down in Mr. now Viscount Cross's Bill, a capital sum of £90,000 had to be raised before a bishop could be appointed; and it has taken ten years or more to raise the sum for the completion of the five new bishoprics, or in round numbers a capital sum of £450,000. Of course at the present time we cannot be expected to go on multiplying bishoprics at such a price. And therefore, if there is to be any further increase of the Episcopate, some other means must be adopted. Some time ago the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol boldly advocated a plan by which this might be done, and that was by taxing the present episcopal incomes, but it is a question whether this will ever take place. And while the laity are ever ready to help forward all legitimate Church work, we question whether they are so enamoured of the proposed extension as to consent to have the burden of raising such a large sum as £90,000 before they can have a diocesan or county bishop in their midst. It is further a moot question whether it is wise to make a number of what might be termed pauper-dioceses, that is, dioceses composed of large populations, but where there is little or no wealth to support the various institutions which should be at work. It is the same we suppose with the diocese as with the parish. A large parish becomes so unwieldy, that it is deemed desirable to cut off one or two districts and to make them into separate parishes, with a clergyman in charge; he has his fixed income, but then there is the organisation which must be kept up, and how is he to do it? If at all, by becoming a mere mendicant, issuing appeals, pleading, entreating for help, the spirit crushed by seeing the poverty around him and unable to help it. And so will it be with the diocese, the income of the bishop assured, but where is the money to come from to keep up all the organisations? possibly a cathedral to be built, and all kinds of organisation to be started. Sooner than this it is far better to let things remain as they are. There is yet another plan which can be worked, and worked effectively, if only the right men are chosen for the work, and that is by means of suffragan-bishops. Whatever may have been thought about the plan years ago, the action of

the Bishop of Bedford, now designate of Wakefield, is enough to show what can be done by what are sometimes called curate-bishops. And if only good and capable men are appointed to this office, they may be of untold help to the Church at large. Of course there is one objection to the system of suffragans, and that is the suffragan-bishop only holds his commission during the life-time of the bishop who appointed him, and the successor may decline to give the same commission; but surely the law might alter this. And where new dioceses are likely to be formed, and the question of endowment only stopping the way, we see no reason why the suffragan-bishop should not have the right of succession to the diocese when it is divided, that is, to the new diocese. We think that if the system of suffragan-bishops was only properly worked it would supply a much-felt want, and perhaps the time will come when the Church can lengthen her cords and strengthen her stakes by forming additional dioceses.

THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.

(Continued from page 177.)

CHAPTER III.

THE EARLY CELTIC CHURCH.

IRELAND had now entered upon her Golden Age. The labours of St. Patrick began to produce an abundant harvest. "He and his fellow labourers had made for themselves, by the labours of their own hands, civilised dwellings amidst the tangled forest and the dreary morass. At a time when clan feuds and bloodshed were rife, and princes rose and fell, and all was stormy and changeful, they had covered the island with monastic schools, where the Scriptures were studied, ancient books collected and read, and native missionaries trained for their own country, and as we shall see, for the remotest parts of the European continent."*

Secundinus, consecrated by St. Patrick, gives us a glowing picture of the labours of our apostle. He tells us that he received his mission from God; that he gloried in the Cross; that he found the divine treasure in the sacred volume; that he was a faithful witness for God in the Catholic faith; that he held the faith in the Trinity of the sacred Name; that both by day and night he prayed to the Lord his God. Benignus, who succeeded St. Patrick in the primacy, devoted himself with zeal to the cultivation of learning and piety, and schools and monastic institutions sprang up with marvellous rapidity throughout the island. Very soon the fame of the Irish seminaries spread over Europe. Thither flocked the young and the noble of all lands. There were colleges and teachers, bishops and clergy, monasteries and monks, churches and congregations; but there was as yet no parochial system, and although the monastic institu-

tions laboured zealously to instruct and civilise the masses, the want of a regular parochial system was deeply felt, and too often bishops and clergy did that which seemed right in the eyes of each.^o

The monasteries, however, formed the great centres of influence. The monastic teachers imparted knowledge with rare skill. They taught astronomy and agriculture, carving and embroidery, and decorated work in metal, bronze, glass, jet, etc. They cultivated music and sculpture, and the Celtic passion for gorgeous display and beautiful objects found ample scope for gratification in the splendid ritual and attractive music of the new religion. In fact, the school and the monastery threw even the Court into the shade. It is characteristic of the age that we are informed in 554 that Tara was abandoned as a royal residence, in consequence of a curse pronounced upon it by St. Ruadhan, from whose sanctuary a criminal had been dragged away to death by the royal command. Its downfall was regarded as a triumph at the time by the ecclesiastical party, but in later times the bards mourned plaintively over the ruin of Tara. We have already referred to the growth of monastic institutions. Of those who contributed to the spread of female monachism the name of St. Brigid, or Bride of Kildare, is in no danger of being forgotten. St. Brigid—one of the three patron saints of Ireland—was born of a noble family at Fochart, near Dundalk, about 453. Her great piety and sweetness of disposition made her a useful agent in spreading the doctrines of Christianity, for which purpose she dedicated herself to a life of perpetual virginity, and, after many years spent in evangelising different parts of Ireland, she settled at Kildare in 480, where her monastery soon rose to influence and honour. She attended St. Patrick on his death-bed, and is said to have woven his shroud. When death closed her labours in 523 or 525 her body was laid in the same grave as the apostle of Ireland.

Paganism, even in its death throes, struggled fiercely against the new creed. The old gods were discredited, but they survived, even among professing Christians, as "fairies" or "good people." The old temples were regarded with awful dread as the haunts of evil spirits whose powers of blessing or cursing were almost unlimited, whose names ought not lightly to be spoken, and whom it was safer to propitiate than to annoy. Druidism had venerated the oak with special reverence, and St. Brigid built her monastery beneath the shade of a mighty monarch of the forest, whence arose the name of Kildare—Church of the Oak. The Druidesses had been associated in companies of nine, and St. Brigid began with nine companions. The fire of the Druid worship burned with a flame that was kept always burning, and the virgins of St. Brigid kept the sacred flame unextinguished from century to century. The Druids, too, had companies of male and female persons devoted to perpetual celibacy, so that monachism was not a new idea in Ireland when the early missionaries used it as a means to evangelise the people.[†]

To this period belongs St. Finnian of Clonard, whose famous seminary produced the illustrious Columbkille. This Irish saint, whose career has thrown that of St. Patrick into the shade, was the son of Fethlimid, and great grandson of the renowned

* Wordsworth, "Church of Ireland," p. 83; Todd, "St. Patrick," p. 27, etc.

† See Killen, "Ecc. Hist. of Ireland," i. pp. 28, 29.

* Maclear, "Apostles of Mediæval Europe," p. 40.

monarch Niall of the Nine Hostages. He was born in 521, at Gartan, near Letterkenny, and nature endowed him with a noble presence, a clear and powerful voice, and a disposition singularly generous and amiable.*

When Columba had finished his education, he laid the foundations of several monasteries; one near Lough Foyle, called Doire Calgaich, on a hill covered with oaks, from which Derry took its name, and another at Dairmagh or Durrow. In A.D. 563 he set out with twelve companions to evangelise the Picts in the Highlands of Scotland. This famous mission took its origin in the following manner:

Columba had a passion for copying manuscripts, and he is said to have borrowed from St. Finnian of Moville a copy of the Psalter, which he set to work and transcribed without the knowledge or permission of the owner. St. Finnian discovered the stratagem by which Columba effected his purpose, but made no move in the matter until the work was completed, when he sent and demanded the copy as belonging to him by right. A violent dispute ensued, which was referred for settlement to Diarmid, the king. His decision was given against Columba in words which became proverbial. "To every cow belongs its calf, and likewise to every book its copy." To this injury the king added a fresh insult before Columba left the palace. It happened that the son of the king of Connaught, playing with the son of Diarmid's steward, struck him and killed him; the youth fled to Columba and claimed sanctuary, but Diarmid had him dragged away and put to death. Columba returned to Donegal, where his quarrel was taken up by his kinsmen, who marched against Diarmid and defeated him with the loss of three thousand men.

But this sanguinary conflict roused the anger of the Irish ecclesiastics. Columba was censured, and condemned to leave Ireland and attach to Christ as many souls as had perished in the battle. In 563 A.D. he landed in Iona, one of the Western Isles, where he erected, after the model of those institutions which he had previously founded in Ireland, a monastery, which became illustrious for the eminent missionaries who later on evangelised Saxon England. About sixty years before the arrival of Columba some members of the family of Eire, prince of Irish Dalriada, had crossed into Scotland, where they founded a kingdom which they named Dalriada. From Conall, prince of this territory, Columba obtained a grant of the island of Iona. The buildings erected by the missionaries were of the simplest kind, consisting of wattled huts, but their wants were few, and in this primitive community idleness found no place. Reading, writing, transcribing MSS., and illuminating service books, tending cattle, sowing corn, ministering to the wants of those who crossed from the mainland to seek their aid as teachers, leeches, or spiritual advisers, rowing their light barks of osier over the foaming waves that broke in thunder over their island home. Such were their occupations.† The reign of

Aodh, or Hugh, the fifth monarch in succession to Diarmid, was marked by the session of the celebrated council known as the Convention of Drumceat, 575. Several important matters were considered by this assembly. Hitherto the chiefs of Dalriada had paid to the king of Ireland a tax imposed by Colman, and known as "Eiric," or "ransom." This tribute the Dalriadans declined to pay any longer, while Hugh was determined to enforce his right to receive it. The matter was referred to Columba, abbot of Iona, who refused to give an opinion, but advised that the case should be submitted to St. Colman, an ecclesiastic famed for his legal knowledge. This dispute was happily settled by the council, and Hugh renounced his claim to the tribute. Another more important dispute arose on the subject of Ollamhs or bards. This class had become exceedingly influential in the country; they were exempt from taxes; their person was inviolate; they ranked next the sovereign, and sat in the national assembly: their influence with the people was great, and their powers of annoyance very considerable. Their number was swelled by crowds of dissolute minstrels, who became professed ollamhs in order that they might live in indolence. The king determined to put an end to the annoyance by expelling the order from the kingdom.

Columba interposed with success on behalf of the bards, pointing out that good wheat should not be rooted up with tares. His advice prevailed, and the ollamhs escaped, but their number was curtailed and their functions prescribed by fixed rules; Columba returned to Iona, where he breathed his last in A.D. 597. He was buried in the same grave with St. Patrick and St. Bride of Kildare.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ST. PAUL: THE AUTHOR OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—There is a strong argument in favour of St. Paul's authorship of the Third Gospel, which, as it was not mentioned in my former letters, I should now like, with your kind permission, to bring before your readers.

A careful scrutiny and analysis of the Third Gospel reveals the fact that there is one cardinal thought in the writer's mind, on which his entire work revolves, and which influences his selection of available materials, and moulds and colours his whole narrative. This thought is the sharp contrast between Pharisee and Publican, to the condemnation of the former and the praise of the latter. This appears most clearly, of course, in the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, recorded in Luke xviii. 9. This is the culminating point, but the same great thought underlies the whole of the Third Gospel, from the first chapter to the last. "He hath put down the mighty from their seat: and hath exalted the humble and meek.

saint published by Colgan. Bede, who wrote in 731, has a comprehensive chapter devoted to this celebrated missionary. Adamnan says that Columba was one "qui etiam a puero deditus Christiano tyrocinio et sapientie studiis (Adam, lib. i. c. l.).

* Compare Lanigan, "Ecc. Hist." II. p. 106, etc. King, "Church Hist. of Ireland," I. pp. 75-107. The best work dealing with Columba is Dr. Reeve's edition of "Adamnan," now unfortunately out of print.

† "Joceline in his 'Life of St. Patrick,' calls him (Columba) the founder of a hundred monasteries"; and the very valuable ancient annals of Ulster describe him as being, "next after St. Patrick the principal promoter of religion throughout the greater part of Ireland and Scotland."—King, I. p. 107.

Adamnan and Cummin, two of his immediate successors wrote lives of Columba, which are preserved among the lives of the

He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away."

The Pharisee is the type of the bigoted Jew, proud of his race and religious prerogatives. The Publican stands for the outcast and despised Gentile sinner—as appears evident from such passages as, "Let him be to thee as a heathen man (*ὁ ἑθνικός*) and a publican" (Matt. xviii. 17)—(*τὰ ἔθνη* being the usual expression both in the New Testament and the LXX. for designating the Gentiles); and "Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?" (Matt. ix. 11); and "They all murmured, saying, that He was gone to be guest with a man (*Zacchæus* the publican) that is a sinner" (Luke xix. 7); and "Then drew near unto Him all the *Publicans* and sinners for to hear Him. And the *Pharisees* and scribes murmured saying, This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them." In these quotations the word for sinners is *ἁμαρτωλοί*—the usual word of contempt in the mouth of a Jew to represent the Gentiles, as appears plainly from Gal. ii. 15, "We who are Jews by nature and not *sinners* (*ἁμαρτωλοί*) of the Gentiles."

I say that this pointed and striking contrast between Jew-Pharisee and outcast-Gentile-sinner underlies and runs through the whole of the Third Gospel. It is not merely as in St. Matthew that the hypocritical formalism of the Pharisees is condemned, and that the publicans and sinners, notwithstanding their degradation, are not to be despised and shut out from the kingdom of Heaven; but there is in the Third Gospel a series of striking and impressive pictures in which Pharisee and Publican, that is Jew and Gentile, are designedly and pointedly contrasted with each other, with the result that the exclusive Pharisee is discomfited and abased, while the Pariah Publican is exalted and triumphant.

Archdeacon Farrar observes:—"The author of the Third Gospel is a great master of light and shade *i.e.*, he shows remarkable skill in the presentation of profoundly instructive personal contrasts—*e.g.*, Zacharias and Mary; Simon and the sinful woman; Martha and Mary; the Pharisee and the Publican; the Good Samaritan, Priest and Levite; Dives and Lazarus; . . . the penitent and impenitent robber." To these I will venture to add the contrast between the elder and the younger brother in the parable of the Prodigal Son in Luke xv., so clearly connected with Acts xv. and Ephesians ii. It is one and the same lesson repeated over and over again in all these skilfully drawn personal contrasts, namely, that outward privileges and legal works are nothing and worse than nothing, only engendering pride; all that is needed in God's sight and in order to be a true Christian is to come in humble penitence and faith to Christ, to hear His word, and to become a new creature in Him. The Gospel is the Gospel of God's free grace, and it is a Gospel for ALL. Those who "have nothing" need only accept Christ by faith in order to "possess all things." This lesson is especially impressed on the mind of the reader by the parabolic teaching of the incident recorded in Luke x. about Martha and Mary, following immediately, as it does, the parable of the Good Samaritan, which contrasts the spontaneous kindness of the outcast, half-heathen stranger with the hard-hearted selfishness of priest and Levite, constantly busied with the Temple service and ritual.

Now it is not sufficient with Dean Alford to recognise "Luke's carefulness in the Third Gospel to record the sayings of our Lord which were assertive of His

unrestricted love for Jew and Gentile alike. We may observe, too (the Dean adds), in Luke those parables and sayings are principally found which most directly regard the great doctrine of man's free justification by grace through faith."

No doubt this is so; but we must go further, and ask ourselves what writer in the first century is there who most thoroughly grasped this marked contrast of Pharisee and Publican, Jew and Gentile? Why, surely the only possible answer is St. Paul. Was he not "the herald, Apostle, and teacher of the Gentiles," "the Apostle of the Gentiles who magnified his office"? (2 Tim. i. 11; Rom. xi. 13). Did he not claim that it was "by revelation God made known unto me the mystery . . . which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto His holy Apostles and prophets by the Spirit, *that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs* (*i.e.*, with the Jews, the chosen people), AND OF THE SAME BODY, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel (*συγκληροῦμα, σύσσωμα, συμμετοχα*), whereof I (Paul) was made a minister" (Eph. iii. 3, 5, 6). Who could better portray the proud arrogance of the privileged Pharisee than St. Paul, who was "brought up at Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers," and who was "zealous toward God"; who, being the "son of a Pharisee," "after the most straitest sect of our religion lived a Pharisee"; "circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law a Pharisee"; who "profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers?" (Acts xxii. 3; xxiii. 6; xxvi. 5; Phil. iii. 5; Gal. i. 14).

And who could better enter into the feelings of the humble, sinful, despised, outcast Publican and Gentile than St. Paul the founder of "all the Churches of the Gentiles?" (Rom. xvi. 4; 1 Cor. iv. 15); who, at the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), as their champion and guardian fought their battle and maintained their rights against the Christian Pharisees—those bigoted Judaizers who ever after opposed his life-work and embittered his life; who said, "Christ came into the world to save sinners (*ἁμαρτωλοί*; *cf.* 'sinners of the Gentiles,' Gal. ii. 15), of whom I am CHIEF" (1 Tim. i. 15). "I am the least of the Apostles, who am not meet to be called an Apostle because I persecuted the Church of God" (1 Cor. xv. 9); "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. iii. 8). "What things were gain to me (*i.e.*, his Jewish privileges), those I counted loss for Christ" (Phil. iii. 7).

St. Paul was the *one* man who had realised and combined in the depth of *his own soul* the feelings, hopes, wants, and state of *both* Pharisee and Publican. According to his own confession, he had, after boasting that he was "a Pharisee of the straitest sect," come to view himself as "the chief of sinners," needing mercy as much as the lowest Publican or the most abandoned Gentile. And he was quite *unique*; there has never been a *second* St. Paul. Moreover, it is altogether impossible to mistake an imperfect image of St. Paul, mirrored in the mind of Luke, for the *real* St. Paul himself. It is admitted that the Third Gospel embodies St. Paul's doctrinal teaching—"my Gospel" (2 Tim. ii. 8). Tradition

connects its production with St. Paul. Much of the second part (the Acts) is devoted exclusively to a detailed account of St. Paul's personal history, and I have shown, in my work, "St. Paul the Author of the Acts," that it is written in St. Paul's *own* peculiar phraseology. Can there be a shadow of a doubt that St. Paul is the real author of the Third Gospel? Does not the fact that the whole book hinges on the contrast between the proud, puffed-up Pharisee *rejected* because of his pride, and the humble, penitent Publican *accepted* with mercy and grace, render it psychologically impossible that it could have proceeded from any other mind than that of St. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles—once Saul, the fierce, bigoted, persecuting Pharisee, but now (in his own estimation) "the chief of sinners," who, enlightened by his own heart-struggles and embodying his own experiences, in giving his version of the Gospel for the furtherance of his great life-work, thus graphically and emphatically and for all time, places Pharisee and Publican, Jew and Gentile, in their right relative positions with regard to the Church of Christ?

H. HEBER EVANS.

April 7th, 1888.

THE NEW QUESTION AND ANSWER CONTROVERSY.

SIR,—Anything to the contrary in the revised Catechism notwithstanding, it seems to me, that a valid distinction exists between, "A means *whereby* we receive," and "a means *wherewith* we receive," in other words between *ab extra* and *intus*. I receive *with* faith what is given *by* bread and wine. In the case of the Lord's Supper both are true and requisite, the one in connection with the "bread and wine," the other for the appropriation of "the Body and Blood of Christ." An argument then may be fairly and justly raised as to whether the new question and answer may not confound and do a certain amount of injustice between these two, that are distinct in themselves, although closely related in the action of "do this," by giving the one more prominence than was due, and by leaving the other with less than was its fair share; or rather, by thrusting the one into the position of the other. This is no afterthought of captious criticism, but was raised and not resolved in the Irish Synod, during the debates on the subject, and the contradiction in terms was carried finally. The effort to disengage the subject from the Romish materialising was well meant, no doubt, but whether done in workmanlike style seems more than doubtful, as done even prejudicially to the fundamental idea of a Sacrament, and verging apparently towards the modern Quaker theory which, dispenses with the "outward and visible sign." There is no call for heated utterances in the discussion of such a subject. Anger is not argument, and vituperation but a poor vindication. The Church is exposed to opposite extremes at the present time as ever before. But if any unprejudiced parties may calmly take exception to the anti-materialistic tendencies appearing manifested after a rather rough and ready fashion, by confounding "whereby" and "wherewith" in this particular specimen of Irish revision, we must ask, Is this any good reason why those ex-revisionists, who so earnestly guarded against the opposite or materialistic tendencies, should wax wroth and insult? Are they

infallible and all else only tyros or drivellers? Viewed clearly and with intelligent modesty and real piety, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, *as it is*, harmonizes these conflicting tendencies, so that the sacrament should at once strike the senses, inform the mind, impress the memory and kindle a great flame of love in the heart of the worthy receiver. And all true friends of the Prayer Book have, with certain exceptions, great reason to rejoice that it has escaped with so little of "the smell of fire upon it" under panic legislation; also that so many hasty efforts to use untempered mortar were rejected. Such *one-sidedness*, instead of calming and correcting, is the surest provocative and justification of *other-sidedness*. But certainly it ought to be no offence to look at "*both sides*," even to sigh for a more even balance after exception taken to a standard work.

AN OLD SYNODSMAN.

P.S. The words in the Latin of the 28th Article are "*Medium quo Corpus Christi accipitur.*"

I CORINTHIANS x. 16.

"The Bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?"

SIR,—It might seem to some that there exists between this assertion of St. Paul's and our Lord's words, on the night of the first institution, a contradiction. For our Saviour's words, "This is My Body, which is given for you," plainly say that of the bread, which St. Paul, while speaking of the same bread as broken, asserts of that which the bread communicates. Our Lord calls it "His Body," on account of the grace which it communicates; St. Paul, the means which communicates that grace, which He calls His Body. But this is only a seeming difference: for while St. Paul is merely referring to the inward grace, of which the bread is the communicating means in the sacrament; our Lord, on the other hand, on account of the grace accompanying the bread, speaks of it, the outward sign, as being His Body which is given for us. In short, St. Paul speaks of that which our Lord calls His Body as the communion, or communicating means of that Body. What then does St. Paul mean when he says, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?" What else can he mean us to understand by the words than this; that the bread, after consecration and prayer, is the means ordained by Christ Himself, whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace, *i.e.*, what he calls the Body and Blood of Christ? In fact, if words mean anything, the word *κοινωνία* must imply a communicating or partaking of something connected with the bread; and the difference between a means of communication and the partaking of what is conveyed is of no account, for what our Lord calls His Body is what St. Paul calls the communion of that Body.

INQUIRENS.

JACOB'S FRAUD.

SIR,—In his sermon on this subject in your last issue, Mr. Hamilton remarks that "as a rule, only one side of the picture has been considered by preachers and expositors," viz, the part played by

Rebecca and Jacob, and he supplies the defect by calling attention to the conduct of Isaac and Esau. It seems to me that even he, in common with the others, has overlooked what is the greatest difficulty in the whole narrative, viz., the conduct which it attributes to God Himself, as the Sovereign Disposer of events, from whose hands alone the coveted blessing could come; and on this part of the transaction I venture to offer a few remarks.

The foundation of the whole narrative is the belief that the son over whom Isaac pronounced his blessing would infallibly become the father of the chosen race, the heir of the promises made to Abraham, the channel through which salvation should come to the world at large. Every actor in the drama, and the historian of it equally, had no doubt that Esau would have obtained this glorious prerogative had Isaac, as he proposed, pronounced the benediction upon him; and all were equally convinced that Isaac's benediction would be efficacious in itself, *ex opere operato*, even if obtained by fraudulent personation, and given contrary to his intention. Out of this belief and conviction the villainous plot sprang. Moreover, as only God could give effect to the benediction, the effect of the history is to represent God's hand as being so absolutely tied by Isaac's action, as to be compelled to bestow in accordance with it, although in point of fact the action of Isaac was procured by means of an audacious and odious fraud.

It is here that the moral difficulty emerges. In every honest man's breast it is felt, and in every modern court of judicature it is held, that proved fraud vitiates a transaction, and that no one has a right to retain advantages acquired by misrepresentation and dishonesty. Only let the charge of personation, forgery, false pretence, be made good, and with the approval of every one the contract, whatever it may be, is quashed, the vote cancelled, the deed or promise declared void; the cheat is stripped of his gain, the thief is compelled to disgorge his spoils. Yet by the sacred historian God Himself is represented as violating this prime and universal law of morals; as confirming to the cheat his ill-gotten gain, and thereby making Himself an accomplice in one of the basest crimes which a younger brother could commit against an elder. To put the matter in the briefest form: Isaac is free to give the blessing to either son; he is basely tricked into giving it contrary to his intention; Heaven rewards the foul deception, and hands over the great prize to the sharper who has successfully purloined it. Such is the tenour of the narrative; such the difficulty which we have to ace.

Everybody knows that this is one of that class of difficulties which forms the staple of popular attacks on the religion of Christians. You tell us, it is urged, that your Bible is the infallible word of God, inspired in every word by His Spirit, true in every statement, a perfect rule of belief and morals. See, then, what sort of a God it portrays for your reverence and worship! Here is an act of perfidy and baseness which every human court of law would invalidate and punish; from which every man of common honesty would instinctively recoil; of which even a hardened villain would be ashamed. Yet your Bible tells you that God, so far from expressing any disapproval of it, or withholding the blessing from the thief who tried to steal it by a lie, rewarded him by making the blessing over to him irrevocably, and thus became a participator in his evil-doing.

To this attack what shall we reply? To parry it by some hair-splitting distinction or far-fetched invention will certainly be of little avail. To say that God's gift of the blessing to Jacob was eternally decreed, and did not depend on the success of the base trick, may be true in itself; and so may be the position, that God may use man's wickedness without being responsible for it; but from the narrative itself these ideas are entirely absent. In *the writer's view* the event was an open one, the fraud decided it in the trickster's favour, and God accepted and carried into effect the decision thus shamefully attained. That is plainly the writer's view, and the writer was no ordinary historian, but an inspired organ of revelation.

For myself, I believe that the true answer to this and similar difficulties is to be found in the distinction between inspiration and infallibility, and in the progressive character of revelation. The conception of God held and expressed by the earliest Biblical writers was in many respects a low and imperfect one, and it was only as moral ideas grew refined and lofty, that the conception could be cleared from its blemishes, and elevated to the glorious perfection which it attains in the teaching of Christ. The God whom we Christians adore is not the God portrayed in Genesis, or even in the Psalter, but the Father portrayed in His Incarnate Son. In Himself, indeed, He is always the same; it is His revealed portrait in the pages of the Bible that has ever been throwing off human obscurations, gaining in truth, advancing in nobility and beauty. The Elohim of the patriarchs, the Jehovah of Israel,—these were but rude and primitive sketches, far though they were beyond the gods of the heathen. But by us, the heirs of the ages, even these have been left behind; for heaven has been opened, the veil withdrawn, and it is given to us to see the glory of the Eternal in the face of Jesus Christ.

PRESBYTER.

“THIS IS MY BODY.”

SIR,—I see letters on this subject in other Church papers; may I say a few words in your papers?

1. This language must be explained by St. Paul's "the bread which we break, is it not the *κοινωνία* of the Body of Christ?" Taking the original word to be either a communicating by the officiator, or a dividing among yourselves—and I suppose there is no other *tertium quid*—it is plain that what is communicated, and what is the mean of so communicating, must be two distinct things. This Rome feels, for in the Rheimish version she thus paraphrases St. Paul: "Is not the Body of Christ the means of uniting you to His Body?" Here, whether what the recipient is united to is our Lord's corporal Body, or His mystical Body, the Church, in both cases we have two bodies, that of which we partake, and that which the partaking unites us to. This is a difficulty which I have not seen grappled with. I know that Rome thinks she has a way out of this dilemma. Is she not the mother of devices? At her word do not vices become virtues? At her word may not two and two make five? Let us hear her. She will say that as food taken becomes part of our body, so our Lord's Body, eaten in the Eucharist, becomes part of our body, which is equivalent to making us part of His Body. But to what does St. Paul's *it* refer? "The bread

which we break." Is it bread that makes us partakers? or is it our Lord's Body broken or slain? Rome says it is not our Lord's Body that is broken, that it is only the bread that is broken. So the literal interpretation and explanation wholly fail. See Bagshawe, with Cardinal Manning's *Imprimatur* p. 124. "Itself remains undivided—the sign only is broken."

2. But I now come to our Lord's own words. I will not dwell upon Rome's assertion that His glorified living Body is spoken of. That notion contradicts the words "given," "broken," and of the blood "shed" out of His veins. Leaving this impossibility, that our Lord should say that the bread was replaced by a dead body, not then existing, or that it is now replaced by a dead body, not now existing, I come to the question found, if not earlier, in Burnett and Jeremy Taylor. Do the words, "this is My Body," state a fact already existing when they were uttered? As Burnett has it, Are they merely declarative? If they are merely declarative of a fact already existing, they do not, they *cannot*, cause that already existing fact. But Rome says that the words, "this is My Body," cause the change. Well, if they cause the change, they are not true when uttered. Words declaring a change as past cannot cause this past change. If the words were, "this shall be My Body," however we may take Body, whether living or dead, there would be no contradiction. But taken literally, "this is," if they produce the change, they are not true. A literal meaning of the words is impossible! I dwell not on Rome's monstrous explanation of "this is My Body," whether dead or alive, to be "Body, blood, soul, and divinity." For shame sake, let her give up the word "literal." She may rush off to the highflown, poetic language of the Fathers, or say that she, of all branches of the Church, has a patent for all such explanations as she pleases; but to say that she takes the words "this is My Body" literally, is one of the most bare-faced and groundless assertions ever made, in any language, ancient or modern.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

SIR,—Your correspondent "B" starts an odd paradox in distinguishing the Romish doctrine of the mass from transubstantiation.

The latter is stated positively enough both in the Canons of Trent and the Creed of Pope Pius, both of which are popularly supposed to be authoritative statements of Roman doctrine. I don't question that "B" can defend his paradox, and perhaps defend it successfully, but the tone of contempt he adopts for your other correspondent's not knowing that transubstantiation and the Romish doctrine of the mass are to be distinguished is clearly unjustifiable. Meanwhile will "B," or anyone else who knows (*e.g.*, Dr. Littledale, if this should meet his eye), tell us exactly what the scholastic doctrine of transubstantiation was? I used to fancy that the accidents were regarded as purely subjective, as Berkeley regards them; but having had occasion to look up Cranmer on the subject, I should gather that both he and Gardiner regarded accidents as objective. I suppose they knew the scholastic doctrine. I should be glad to know what it is and how exploded, but I daresay these are big questions.

ERIGENA.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE SERMON BIBLE." Vol. I. Genesis to 2 Samuel. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

IN the introduction, the editor, too modest to name himself, says, "It is attempted to give the essence of the best homiletic literature of this generation. As the series is to be completed in twelve volumes, proportion has been carefully studied, and the space allotted to each book corresponds with the number of sermons preached upon it. Blank pages for additional references are given at the end." The editor has done his work well, and we think the "Sermon Bible" will really prove a great help to preacher and teacher. It will be most useful for reference and for suggesting thoughts, especially for the extempore preacher. The list of works, magazines, etc., consulted occupies twelve pages, and we have not found any name omitted from *modern* preachers. The ancients are not consulted—we think this a pity: surely Latimer, Tillotson, Horsley, Rutherford, Bishop Butler, and others from the mighty dead could have supplied thoughts worth preserving. However, if the moderns only must occupy the field, the editor has shown a praiseworthy catholicity, and he has produced a most useful book.

Some very curious texts have at various times been chosen. "The gold of that land is good," supplied F. E. Paget with a sermon. Baring Gould preached from "A window shalt thou make in the ark." A. Mursell from "Whose daughter art thou?" W. M. Taylor from "I have learnt by experience." Baldwin Brown from "Now I am become two bands." J. E. C. Welldon from "Tell me, I pray Thee, Thy name." J. B. Figgis from "The cup was found in Benjamin's sack"—we should say from the "skeleton" that this was a very good sermon. C. J. Vaughan from "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk"—he does not appear to have told his hearers that some Rabbin deduced therefrom a doctrine that butter and meat must not be eaten at the same meal. Bishop Alexander and Spurgeon have preached from "I wound and I heal." Five divines from "Ye have not passed this way heretofore." T. Champness and J. W. Burgon from "Where hast thou gleaned to-day?" There is a sermon on Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, there is also one on David's wish to drink of the water of the well of Bethlehem, to both of these in addition to the other references should be added a reference to Dean Plumptre, "Lazarus, and other poems." There are sermons in poems as well as in stones.

Only one volume has been published yet; we shall look out the for second.

"EXPOSITIONS." By Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D. Vol. IV. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

THIS concluding volume of "Expositions" contains twenty-nine sermons, a parable—not a very good one—and a Preface—a sad one. We are exceedingly sorry to hear that Dr. Cox "must cease to preach shortly after this volume appears," and further, that he must in any case have discontinued publishing sermons which did not pay. They ought to pay. "Many clergymen," he says, "have written to tell me they use my sermons in their pulpits"—that is very honest in them—to confess, we mean not to steal

they might at least buy first and steal afterwards. But what would you have ! Dr. Cox must give up his work,—so must we all, sooner or later. He has written many volumes which help and refresh thoughtful men (whether they agree with his views on eschatology or not), but these are a minority, and “the great world goes its way ;” it has its farm and its five yoke of oxen, it has the money market and the fashions ; it has pheasants to shoot and balls to attend ; it has its dinner to get and its newspapers to read, much more interesting to it than Dr. Cox’s sermons, which are not at all calculated to make the seekers after excitement gape and stare, they contain no novel and startling adjectives, but are quiet scholarly productions. Dr. Cox is amongst those who teach the teachers, if his readers have been few they have at least been fit ; we shall miss his volumes, which we have read but never stolen from. And we are glad to hear he has had the consolation of “kindly and generous appreciation from the organs of the Established Church,” more than any other Nonconformist author ; he will at last receive infinitely higher amongst those

Ob patram pugnando vulnera passi ;
 Quique sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat ;
 Quique pii vates, et Phoebæ digna locuti ;
 Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes ;
 Quique sui memores alios fecere merendo ;
 Omnibus his niveâ cinguntur tempora vittâ.

The Expositions themselves do not much differ from their predecessors ; the same quiet scholarly manner, the same optimistic tendency, the same absence of wrath against sin—only sorrow, not “fiery indignation.” The sermon on “Apples of gold in baskets of silver” is too fanciful. Why does every volume of sermons contain one on the young ruler ?

We conclude with one extract, showing Dr. Cox at his best. “If we are wise we shall find in the very inequalities of life a warrant of immortality. We shall take all the wrongs, losses, and sorrows of time, with all the perplexity and pain they breed within us, not as proofs that God is unjust or unkind, but rather as proofs that our life has been laid out on a nobler scale, and mounts to a loftier end than we had imagined ; as proofs that we do not die when we die, but pass into a world for which the discipline of this life is intended to prepare us, a world in which the training commenced here, will be continued and carried to a close so large and lofty that even faith cannot fully grasp it, so glorious as to transcend all the fond prophecies of hope. To every troubled and heavy-laden soul, then, aching and perplexed under the wrongs of life, I bring the word of Christ, God is good and means your good. The very inequalities of this present time which you so much resent, prove that He is training you, not for this life alone but for immortality. Let not your eyes be clouded with dark and evil thoughts of Him, because His goodness transcends the measure of a mortal mind. You have the promise of His mercy already. Only wait and trust, and you shall have the proof of His mercy ere long.”

THE consecration of Canon Puleine as Suffragan-Bishop of Penrith is fixed for St. Philip and James’s Day, May 1st.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old

Mexico ; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Barwell, Rev. A. H. S., Rector of Patching, Worthing.
 Baynes, Rev. A. H., Vicar of St. James’s, Nottingham ; Senior Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury.
 Belcher, Rev. Gilbert Edward, M.A., Rector of Shaldon, Surrey.
 Blythe, Rev. Edward Hamilton, M.A., Vicar of St. John’s-the-Baptist’s, Margate ; Vicar of Woodchurch, near Ashford, Kent.
 Danks, Rev. William, Vicar of St. Margaret’s, Ilkley ; Rural Dean of Keighley.
 Davis, Rev. Charles, B.A., late Curate of Holy Trinity, Leicestershire ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hinckley, Leicestershire.
 Drew, Rev. A. W. M., Senior Curate of Gainsborough ; Vicar of Rauceby, near Sleaford.
 Dyke, Rev. E. F., M.A., Vicar of Maidstone ; Rural Dean of Sutton.
 Evans, Rev. T. Howel, Rector of Farthingstone ; Rector of Maidford, Towcester.
 Foulkes, Rev. Robert, B.A., Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
 Fox, Rev. John Kirkham, B.A., Curate of Woodchurch, Kent ; Vicar of Birchington-with-Acol, Kent.
 Hancock, Rev. W. E., Vicar of Christ Church, Upper Armley, Leeds ; Vicar of Knaresborough.
 Hart, Rev. Henry Chicheli, B.A., Rector of Cranwith, with the Vicarage of Dillington and the Rectory of Colveston annexed, Norfolk.
 Henning, Rev. G. S., M.A., Curate of Horsington ; Vicar of Long Sutton, Somerset.
 Jayne, Rev. F. J., M.A., Vicar of Leeds ; Honorary Canon of York Cathedral.
 Lane, Rev. Ernald, M.A., Prebend of Ufton Cantoris in Lichfield Cathedral.
 Lowe, Rev. Henry William, M.A., General License in the Diocese of Lichfield.
 Moncrief, Rev. Archibald, M.A., Vicar of Rugeley, Staffordshire.
 Pigott, Rev. George William, B.A., Prebend of Wolvey in Lichfield Cathedral.
 Porter, Rev. George, M.A., Rector of Wickford, Essex.
 Powell, Rev. Arthur H., M.A., LL.B., Assistant Secretary to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
 Riddlesden, Rev. John B., M.A., Curate of Wolstanton, Stoke-on-Trent ; Vicar of Stoney Middleton, Derbyshire.
 Sandwith, Rev. William Fitzgerald Gambier, B.A., Vicar of Holkham and Rector of Egmore-with-Waterden, Norfolk.
 Taylor, Rev. J. Kinnersly, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Great Smeaton-with-Appleton Wiske, Yorks.
 Williams, Rev. Raymond O., M.A., Curate of Oakham ; Chaplain to the High-Sheriff of Anglesea (Mr. H. H. Williams).

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Mackenzie, Rev. Charles, M.A., Rector of All Hallows and United Parishes, Lombard Street, Prebendary of St. Paul’s. Founder of the City of London College for Young Men, at 35, Woburn Square, on the 16th inst., aged 81.
 Mackey, Rev. Donald John, M.A., formerly Vicar of Cleeton St. Mary, at 14, Mann Street, Hastings, on the 12th inst., aged 43.
 Owen, Rev. Loftus, Vicar of St. Giles’, Shrewsbury, on the 9th inst., aged 56.
 Sweet-Escott, Rev. Cecil Talbot, M.A., at Stagsden Villa, 33, Chatsworth Road, West Norwood, on the 10th inst., aged 34.
 Tooke, Rev. T. H., late Rector of Monkton-Farley, Wilts, at Uppingham, suddenly, on the 15th inst., aged 75.
 Wright, Rev. Robert Blayney, M.A., Rector of Frinsted, and Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford, on the 12th inst., aged 61.



The Church of England Pulpit.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT.

BY REV. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, ON
SUNDAY, APRIL 15TH, 1888.

"For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show My power in thee, and that My name might be declared throughout all the earth."—ROMANS ix. 17.

NO event in the history of the Old Testament is in the mind of the Church of Christ so closely connected with the yearly festival of our Lord's resurrection as the deliverance of Israel from the Egyptian bondage. This was the conviction of the earliest Christian Church; this is the conviction of the Church of the present day. It will not have escaped you that all the three lessons from the Old Testament which are appointed to be read on Easter Day, refer to events connected with the Exodus—to the Institution of the Passover, to the journeyings of the children of Israel to the Red Sea, to the great Egyptian overthrow. The history of the Exodus has this in common with the Resurrection of our Lord, that either event is a deliverance from a bondage, a triumph over a hostile and oppressive power. In the one case a nation is delivered; in the other He in whom all the nations of the earth are blessed. In the one case an earthly tyranny is vanquished and defeated; in the other the unearthly powers of sin and death. The connecting link between the two is found in the Passover, which was instituted on the eve of the exodus from Egypt to commemorate the saving of the first-born of Israel, and immediately after the celebration of which the death and resurrection of our Lord took place. So that we sing with St. Paul, "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast"; and with the Church, "Christ is the very Paschal Lamb, which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world; who by His death has destroyed death, and by His rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life." And in the baptismal service we recall the Red Sea, through which the children of Israel were led, as figuring those waters of baptism through which we pass out of the bondage of our old nature into the freedom of the new. And thus when we sang in the anthem this afternoon the old Hebrew psalm, "When Israel out of Egypt came, and the house of Jacob from the strange land; then was Judah his sanctuary, Israel his dominion,"

Vol. XXV.—No. 644.

we read into a new and richly Christian meaning the triumph of Christ over the grave, the triumph achieved for us and in us, the conquest of sin, the conquest of Satan, the conquest of death.

Now the deliverance from Egypt brings before us two prominent figures—Moses, the law-giver and leader of the chosen people, and Pharaoh, the King of Egypt, the head—as Israel called him—of the House of Bondage. Let us, under the guidance of St. Paul, consider what we ought to think about the less interesting of these two figures—King Pharaoh. Pharaoh, as you know, was the common name of all the kings of Egypt. The word points to the sun, "Ra," whose representative on earth the Egyptian king for the time being was believed by his people to be. The Egyptian king was called by his people, and by strangers, too, Pharaoh; the greatness of the office quite overshadowed the person of the holder; who Pharaoh might be was a matter of little importance, provided there was one. And thus in the description of the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt in the early part of the book of Exodus, it would appear from the narrative that only one king was referred to, whereas we know from independent sources that there were really two. The Pharaoh of the earlier oppression was Rameses II., the last of the four greatest conquerors who ruled in ancient Egypt. The Pharaoh of the Exodus himself was his third son, Menephtah, who succeeded to the throne some time before the catastrophe in the Red Sea. It was to this last king that Moses addressed the words which are quoted by St. Paul; they were uttered just before the plague of hail: "For this cause have I raised thee up, that My name might be declared throughout all the earth."

A man of the world and a religious man look at the same question in different lights. Let us endeavour to understand how the question of dealing with the Israelites in Egypt may have presented itself to the mind of Pharaoh Menephtah; for why a monarch, even a Pagan despotic monarch, should set himself to oppress a large class of his subjects, does not at once occur to us. Why should he not wish to live on good terms with them, and to encourage in them kindly feelings towards himself? Why should it not be a pleasure to him to know that, although he was their absolute master, he had their good wishes? This surely is human nature. Why should he set himself to make enemies—exasperated and desperate enemies—of a population which it might not have been more difficult for him to conciliate than it had been for the Pharaoh of Joseph's time, the shepherd king Apophis? This question would, perhaps, have been answered by Menephtah by pointing to the circumstances of the kingdom of Egypt at the time of the exodus. When Abraham went down into Egypt, and when, three generations later, Joseph became a kind of Prime Minister of the reigning Pharaoh, Egypt was ruled

by shepherd kings, as they were called. These shepherd kings were really chiefs of Asiatic tribes ; they had settled in that triangular district of country—the delta between the modern Cairo and the Mediterranean. They had confined the old native kings of Egypt to the Southern portion of the country, and had made them tributaries, virtually subjects. These shepherd kings, being Asiatics of some kind, welcomed the first fathers of the race of Israel as in some distant degree probably akin to themselves, and so they extended to the patriarchs the various favours described in the books of Genesis. Some little time after Joseph's death a great change took place ; a descendant of the ancient native Kings of Egypt defeated the reigning shepherd king, and not only revolted, but reconquered from him the whole of Northern Egypt, and expelled the Asiatic dynasty which had ruled it. This is the meaning of that saying of Scripture that "another king arose which knew not Joseph." He was not only a personally distinct king, but a king of a distinct and hostile dynasty. Two consequences followed from this important change of circumstances. The first was a series of the most dreadful kind of wars of revenge, in two successive dynasties—the eighteenth and the nineteenth. Four great monarchs, of whom Rameses II., the Pharaoh of the oppression, was the last, poured the army of Egypt across the Lebanon district to the banks of the Orontes and the Euphrates, and they were chiefly engaged with that great race of whose history and power learned men have only just learned the real outline within the last twenty years. The other consequence was that the position of the Israelites in Egypt was altogether changed : instead of being regarded with favour by the ruling powers, they were looked upon with dislike and suspicion, and perhaps, in view of their increasing numbers, with fear ; and as the timid are especially wont to be cruel, the oppression of the Israelites was mainly the result of this fear. When Rameses II. was conducting a difficult campaign on the Orontes against a very powerful Asiatic enemy, he thought with some misgiving of the numerous tribes of Asiatics who were living and thriving on the soil of Egypt, in the neighbourhood, too, of his Northern capital, and the measures which he took for reducing their numbers as described in the book of Exodus—he obliged their male population to engage in forced labour—were a consequence of this misgiving. The oppression of the Israelites was the act of a patriotic despot, embarrassed by no such scruples on the score of humanity as would be natural to us, and thinking only of what was the prudent course to take in the interests of Egypt in critical circumstances. The oppression lasted for many years. Rameses, we know, died at an advanced age, and his son Menephtah, inherited with his father's throne his father's policy.

That the Israelites should be kept at hard servile work in Egypt appeared to him to be good common-sense recommended by the authority and experience of his deceased father. If he was to show a bold front to the great Asiatic powers beyond the frontier, he must keep the Asiatics within the frontier well under his heel. Now Israel, as we know, was not only a nation, it was a church, not only instinct with the sense of patriotism and the love of freedom, but conscious of possessing a higher knowledge of God than the heathen around it. It was this which led to the demand for permission to go into the desert for the purpose of offering a solemn act of worship to God, which the circumstances of the bondage, and probably the prejudices of the Egyptians, forbade at Zoan. Such a proposal on the part of the elders of the enslaved tribe seemed to the cruel-hearted Egyptian statesmen not less than preposterous. And then, after a temporary hesitation, he determined to prevent their going at all costs, and we know what the costs really were. Such, then, was, we may reasonably conjecture, the mind of Pharaoh Menephtah, when plague after plague and remonstrance after remonstrance was directed to shake his resolution. Perhaps it may occur to us to ask whether he was not, after all, from his own point of view, right, and whether there is in equity and reason any sufficient ground for the stern words which Moses addressed to him in the name of God, and which St. Paul quotes with such entire approval : "For this cause have I raised thee up, that I might show My power in thee, and that My name might be declared throughout all the earth."

"For this cause have I raised thee up." How can we reconcile it with the Divine attributes of justice and mercy that a human body should thus be brought upon the stage of life in order to illustrate the powerlessness of the creature who presumes to measure himself against the will of the Creator? The truth is, that such passages of Holy Scripture as that state one side, and only one side, of the complete truth. They put before us very vividly God's sovereignty in His own world ; they do not notice, as other passages of Scripture do notice, man's persistent free-will and entire responsibility. If God raises up men like Pharaoh to show forth His own moral supremacy, Pharaoh is all the while the master of his own destiny ; he is raised up to be what he became by his own resolve, by his own rejection of the light which might have saved him, by his own clinging to the errors which he might have rejected. Observe that Pharaoh Menephtah was not without means of knowing, or, at any rate, of shrewdly suspecting, something of the true character and mission of the people of Israel as the people of Revelation. His bearing before Moses and Aaron again and again implies this, and it may be gathered from some independent considerations.

The earliest religion of Egypt, as we know from the monuments, was certainly belief in one supreme power, and this had only become degraded into worship of the various functions and aspects of Nature as so many separate divinities in the course of long ages. The secret of the ancient truth was still preserved by the priestly colleges attached to the Egyptian temple of Thebes, Memphis, Abydos, and each Egyptian monarch could, if he wished, be initiated into it.

This was the wisdom of the Egyptians in which, as Stephen tells us, Moses was learned. He did not, indeed, learn the unity of God from the Egyptian priests, but his ancestral faith may thus have been illustrated by that which he learned from them. Then in the dynasty which immediately preceded that of Menepthah, the Egyptian king had actually endeavoured to restore the worship of one god under the crude form of devotion to the sun's disc. This attempt got the king into great and varied trouble, but the circumstances must have been well-known to all the kings of the succeeding dynasty, and the holy truth that there is only one God must have been impressed more and more distinctly on their consciences by the spasmodic though resultless effort of their bitterly condemned predecessor. When Moses stood before Pharaoh, he touched a chord, if not of sympathy, at least of apprehension, in the mind and conscience of his royal hearer, and the desperate determination of Pharaoh to turn a deaf ear was the conduct of a man who wishes not only to awe an outward opponent, but to crush his inward personal misgiving in the hope that if he only resisted long enough it would disappear. Thus it was that he was by turns obdurate and yielding, until at last he engaged in the enterprise which led to the freedom and triumph of Israel. There is no necessity for our entering on the critical questions which have been raised with respect to the Exodus, such as whether the scene of the event was what we call the Red Sea or the ancient lake on the coast of the Mediterranean; nor again whether Pharaoh Menepthah lost his life or escaped after the loss of his army. One thing is quite certain—namely, that the event was an enormous blow to the power of Egypt. The event, indeed, is not mentioned in the contemporary inscriptions on the monuments—no national disasters ever are, but its effects appear in the reduced power and circumstances of the Egyptian monarchy. Egypt never again became the power which it had been—the effect of the disasters which overwhelmed Pharaoh Menepthah are written on the face of history, and his name is remembered as that of one whose destiny it was to show forth the power of Him whose will he resisted, and to show forth among the nations the divine name he would fain have silenced. There are some practical points which suggest themselves for consideration.

We have, first of all, before us the pathetic and awful spectacle of the growth of a human being into an attitude of fixed opposition to the all-holy and Almighty God. I say the growth of a human being, for it was a growth, it did not come to be all at once, no man becomes utterly evil all at once; he is only, perhaps, half conscious of the direction he is taking and the change which is slowly but surely going on within him. There was a time, no doubt, when Pharaoh Menepthah was a bright, thoughtless boy, with a kind mother who loved him tenderly, and as he grew up, he was probably, at first, and generally, well-meaning according to his lights, and his actions as we have seen might have been at any rate first shaped in part by the traditions of his family, or the supposed or real necessities of his position. But these were not irresistible, and at last the work of hardening was complete, and by a well-known licence of language God is said to have done that which He permitted—to have hardened Pharaoh's heart so that he would not let the people go. Throughout the long ages of Jewish and Christian history no name more represents emphatic hostility to the honour of God among men, or the discomfiture which, sooner or later, awaits that hostility, than that of Pharaoh, King of Egypt. As the Jew passed in review the names of the enemies of his people—Titus, Antiochus Epiphanes, Nebuchadnezzar, Sennacherib, Goliath, Jabin—Romans, Græco-Syrians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Philistines, Canaanites—none seemed to loom so large in the perspective of history as the Pharaoh whom Moses had defied. And as the Christian looks back from a more distant age on that yet earlier history, he, too, sees, in the enemies and oppressors of God's people that which the Jews saw in them; but he sees, perhaps, with his larger and clearer faith something more, he knows that they are dark shadows on earth of that invisible spirit whose seal is fixed in antagonism to God, and who can mould man in different degrees into being his agent and his instrument. Isaiah's description of the descent of the King of Babylon into the world of the dead melts insensibly into the more awful picture of the fall of Satan. "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit." And in the same way the words which Moses addressed to Pharaoh, and which St. Paul quotes so emphatically, are less true of mortal man than the fallen archangel, "For this cause have I raised thee up, that I might show My power in thee, and that My name might be

declared throughout all the earth." Satan, too, was once a bright and glorious angel who rejoiced in the service of the Most Holy, but who fell when his will was warped by pride. Satan, too, had his time of trial, he was not forced, God forbid! to be the Prince of Evil, he became it in the exercise or, rather, in the abuse of his perfectly free will. But, having chosen to be the first-born of rebellion, he was not simply at large as a disturbing force: the evil which the all holy God could not have created, He might permit, He might control; in the vast universe there was a place and a function assigned to the apostle of universal revolt.

"For this cause have I raised thee up, that I might show My power in thee, and that My name might be declared throughout all the earth." We Christians know that that power was exhibited when our Lord and Saviour by His cross and death spoiled principalities and powers; we know that it was exhibited, when, by death He destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and delivered them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage. We are told that men no longer believe in Satan, that for our generation the invisible house of bondage, with its fallen monarch, no longer exists. If this be so, a great deal more is, or will be presently, disbelieved in as well as Satan. But a Christian who submits to and accepts the teaching of the New Testament cannot but be struck with this fresh proof of the finished ingenuity of our great spiritual enemy. Like those masters of the art of earthly war, who conquered less frequently by ostentatious display of force on the battle-field than by carefully concealed surprises which turned the position of an antagonist at a critical moment: so Satan, it would seem, has persuaded a frivolous and shallow generation, or some members of it, that he no longer exists but as a discredited phantom of the past, as an extinct terror, it may be a popular joke. Ah! he has not been at work upon the human heart for nothing during these many thousands of years. He knows how to lull us to sleep to the best advantage, that he may take our thoughts and affections, and, above all, our passions well into his keeping. "He sitteth lurking in the thievish corners of the streets, and privily in his lurking dens doth he murder the innocent; his eyes are set against the poor. For he lieth, waiting secretly, even as a lion lurketh he in his den, that he may ravish the poor, when he getteth him into his net. He falleth down and humbleth himself, that the congregation of the poor may fall into the hands of his captains. He hath said in his heart, Tush! God hath forgotten, He hideth away His face, and He will never see it. Arise, O Lord God! and lift up thine Hand; forget not the poor." "Why boastest thou thyself, thou tyrant, that thou canst do mischief; whereas the goodness of God endureth yet daily? Thy tongue imagineth wickedness, and with lies thou

cuttest like a sharp razor. Thou hast loved unrighteousness more than goodness, and to talk of lies more than righteousness. Thou hast loved to speak all words that may do hurt, O thou false tongue! Therefore shall God destroy thee for ever."

And Satan is only an instance of that which may take place, and does take place within the compass of human life and experience. And the gradual growth of the spirit of resistance to the known will of God culminates at last, not in the triumph of the rebel, but in his being assigned a truly awful place in the plans of the Divine providence, in which he is to illustrate not the mercy, but the justice of the Omnipotent.

And, next, observe that some good natural qualities may exist in a man who, nevertheless, perhaps, dies as an opponent to the will of God. There is a bust of Pharaoh in the museum at Cairo, which, we are told, may be considered an authentic portrait, and as we stand before the grave, but by no means unkindly Coptic face, it is difficult to think that it represents a human being to whom the solemn and stern words were addressed in the name of the All-Merciful: "For this cause have I raised thee up, that I might show My power in thee, and that My name might be declared throughout all the earth." And yet that this is possible is a matter of experience. A man may not be merely respectable, but even interesting, and yet throughout his life opposed to the cause and honour of God and the highest and truest interests of his fellow-men. This fatal opposition may be due to some warp in the will or some lack of sensitiveness in the conscience. History abounds with instances of men who, with good points in their natural character, have yet been in the great struggle between good and evil, between God and that which opposes Him, on the wrong side. And this spectacle is much more pathetic, I had almost said more dreadful, than when a thoroughly bad man is opposed to God. That Nero should burn the Christians by night in the gardens of the Janiculum in order to amuse the Roman populace and divert public attention from his own wrong-doing, that he should crucify St. Peter with his head downwards, and behead St. Paul, seems to be quite natural and in order, considering what sort of a person Nero was. But contrast Nero with the Apostate Emperor Julian. Julian was brave, generous, earnest, self-denying—a high-toned soldier, a severe student, a man whom to know was to respect, if not exactly to love. It is true that Julian had advantages which were unknown to Nero; he was brought up as a child in the faith of our Lord and Saviour; he knew what the Christian life was, and what it could be, he had opportunities of meeting men who deserved the name of saints. And yet he not only deliberately rejected and scorned the faith of Christ, he bitterly persecuted it and devoted his undoubtedly

great powers to restoring, so far as he could, the expiring Paganism to its old place as the religion of the Roman world. He died during an expedition into Central Asia, owning, it was said, that the Galilean—so he called our Lord—had been too strong for him. If he had been an idle profligate sensualist, indifferent to human welfare, indifferent to human suffering, as were not a few of those who sat on the throne of the Roman world, his case would have been less pathetic. It is his natural excellences which throw out into such sharp and painful relief the general drift of Julian's career as that of one of the bitterest opponents whom our Lord Jesus Christ has encountered during the whole history of His Church of earth. Julian seems like Pharaoh to have been raised up that the crucified and risen Redeemer might show in him His power, and His name might be declared in all the earth. Let us be sure these examples very well apply in private life, and on a smaller scale. Each one of us is certainly changing as the years pass, but it does not follow that we are growing better because we are growing older. Good natural qualities—industry, justice, temperance, kindness, courage, even some sort of self-denial—do not of themselves prove that a man is not in his deepest being living in opposition to God. These qualities are consistent with a general drift of life which is opposed to His will; they are no guarantee that a man has that tenderness and sensitiveness of conscience, that quick eye for God's truth and honour which will enable him to see the line of duty in difficult circumstances, which will save him from the misery of finding himself at the last among those who have fought against God. We must have known such people in life; have we not, perhaps, reason to fear lest we ourselves should be of the number of petty Pharaohs who will illustrate God's power rather than His mercy on the Day of Judgment.

And, once more, Pharaoh's history bids us reflect how easily those who are in superior and engrossing positions may be fatally blinded to the highest and best interests of others who are dependent upon them. Pharaoh, no doubt, had his head and his hands full of questions of high policy and great affairs of State—too full, he may have thought, to give much time to the complaints of a troublesome tribe of Asiatic bondsmen. Their distress and importunate petitions only inspired him with impatience and contempt; his heart was hardened; he closed his eyes and ears when he ought to have kept them wide open to all the indications of God's will and human needs round him, and so he drifted on to his ruin. May not something of the same kind occur to any who are entrusted by Providence with the superintendence and care of others—not only the rulers of nations and churches, but the great employers of labour, and the heads of educational institutions, and the fathers and mothers of families? An Israel may

be close round them, to whose real wants they are insensible, but of which they have had ample warning, and meanwhile time is passing, and they are approaching some catastrophe; the ruin of families, societies, institutions may be due to some fatal insensibility on the part of those who direct them, some inability to enter into their moral and spiritual requirements.

And, lastly, there is here great comfort for those who desire to serve God in the conviction that in the end He will triumph over all His opponents, however long the triumph be delayed. This is implied in the words uttered by Moses to Pharaoh. Pharaoh was sitting on his throne in all the pride of the Egyptian monarchy's brightest days when Moses dared to tell him that he was raised up in order to set forth the power of God. God allows much evil to exist. This is a distress and perplexity to His servants; they cannot understand why He should long submit to appear to be vanquished in His own world. Wait, and you will see. If God is patient, it is because He is eternal. Pharaoh for a while was borne with, remonstrated with, instructed, frightened, warned before the Dead Sea closed upon him and his army. Still more sure of this should we Christians be who are still gazing with the apostles of old into the empty sepulchre from which the stone has been rolled away, and who know that He who has left it is the first and the last; He that liveth and was dead, and behold He is alive for evermore, and He holds the keys of hell and of death. Sin may still be strong, death may still be terrible, Satan still a standing menace, but we know whom we have believed. These enemies will only illustrate our Redeemer's power. We know whom we have believed, that God doth all things through Christ, whose strength is in us.

At a meeting of the Fellows of Sion College on Tuesday, it was resolved, on the motion of the Rev. J. L. Fish, seconded by the Rev. T. Darling, that a petition against the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill should be presented to the House of Lords.

WE understand that the Rev. Canon Cook, of Exeter, the precentor of that cathedral, better known as the editor of the *Speaker's Commentary*, has appointed as his deputy for the present year the Rev. Prebendary Sandford, vicar of Cornwood, on condition that Mr. Sandford comes into residence for four consecutive months. Canon Cook resigns to his deputy two-thirds of the emoluments attached to the canonry, retaining a third only, and the Canon's house, from which he is too ill to remove. This arrangement is viewed with much satisfaction in the diocese, and is understood to have been spontaneous on the part of Canon Cook. The arrangement by which Prebendary Sandford becomes Canon by deputy only anticipates a previous arrangement by which, if he remains in the diocese, he will become Residentiary Canon in succession to Archdeacon Earle.—*Record*.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
 and all Pulmonary
 Affections can be
 immediately re-
 lieved and rapidly
CURED
 by simply
 using
 the

AMMONIAPHONE

FOR
 THE
 Voice,
 Throat,
 Chest,
 and Lungs.

21s. post free.
 WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by
 the Royal Family, and principal
 Physicians, Clergymen,
 Vocalists, and Public Speakers
 throughout the country. New illus-
 trated Pamphlet with copies of Thou-
 sands of Testimonials
 may be had
 on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

Corner of Rabbittone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1888.

THE TITHE RENT CHARGE BILLS.

LORD SALISBURY'S second Bill, which is entitled "Tithe Rent Charge Recovery and Variation Bill," has been printed. It certainly provides very complete machinery for fixing the payment of tithe irretrievably on the owner of the soil, without, as far as we can see, any compensation whatsoever. Some clergymen think that substitution of a triennial for the septennial valuation of corn is an adequate bonus to the owner for undertaking the payment of the tithe in perpetuity, and constituting it a real rent-charge on his land. No doubt if the average is reduced at one stroke from a septennial to a triennial, a small percentage of gain will accrue to the present owner. The question is whether that small bonus will be an adequate satisfaction to the owners for saddling themselves and the land itself, and not as heretofore its precarious produce, with a perpetual rent-charge. We are inclined to think that the landowner would prefer to revert to the barbarous system of taking the tithes in kind in vogue before the Commutation Act of 1836, and allow the titheowner himself to gather and sell a tenth of the produce of the soil, with all its attendant risks and expenses. This Bill provides for the abolition of distress for recovery of tithe, except when the land is occupied by its owner. It enables the County Court Judge to give an order for recovery of tithe in case the net profit of the land to the owner exceeds the amount claimed as tithe rent-charge, but in case there is no profit or the profit is less than the rent-charge, the judge may order that a part or the whole of the tithe rent-charge be remitted. Section 4 of the Bill provides an alter-

native procedure for tithe recovery, when the land is not occupied by its owner, viz., by an injunction on the occupier not to pay any rent until he has paid out of the profits of the land the amount specified in the injunction as due for tithe rent charge. There are other provisions as to the relations of owner and occupier, as to the cases where there are two tithe rent-charges on the same land, as to the recovery of tithe rent-charge on gate or stinted lands, and where it is payable as a rate per head. All these provisions are of little concern to the titheowner.

It appears to us that the practical problem which our legislators have before them, is to make an adjustment of the present cumbrous system of settling the amounts to be paid to titheowners, and to provide at the same time the best mode of enforcing payment. Both of these processes are purely matters of business, and in all business matters the simplest methods are the best. Surely it is very unbusiness-like to allow the stipend of the clergyman to fluctuate in accordance with the price of his bread, perhaps the smallest item of his expenditure, and annual variation in the tithe is equally annoying and irritating to the tithepayer. We think, therefore, that a plan of commutation, like that in force in Ireland, is the best. In that country a valuation was made of the amounts claimable by the titheowners, and payable by the occupiers of the land from its produce; but instead of the titheowners continuing to have this right over the occupiers, they are given a right of a less contribution from the landowners secured on the land itself and not on its produce. These amounts were settled *once for all* in invariable annual payments to be made in pounds sterling. This system continues still, although the property of the titheowners and the Church has been confiscated to the Government by the Act of 1869. A serious objection to thus simplifying the amount and incidence of the tithe property, the force of which we fully recognise, is that it facilitates the future secularisation and confiscation of the Church property.

Again, if the occupiers are no longer to pay the parson his dues, a practice which is fraught in most cases with considerable advantages to both Church and people, we think that the tithe ought to be collected by some central body or by the Government tax-collectors, and paid over to the individual clergymen.

Instead of adopting some such simple method of valuing the tithe, and making it a real rent charge on the land with a short, sharp and effectual means of recovering it, Lord Salisbury follows Mr. Gladstone's vicious plan of devolving the solution of the whole question on the County Court Judges. A plan calculated to involve the parties in infinite annoyance and expense and perpetual hostility. A proceeding which in Ireland has shaken the rights of property to their very foundations. These are

rights which should be left as little as possible to the discretion of the Law Courts, and to be canvassed in the County Courts. They ought surely to be settled on the best and surest and most unequivocal foundations by our legislators. We shall look with considerable interest for Lord Salisbury's third Bill for the redemption of tithe, which we regard as the only true, satisfactory and final remedy for the tithe difficulty.

A SCENE IN THE DUBLIN SYNOD.

RITUALISM has made great way, through the apathy of our authorities—great way in churches, University and Church Press—Mass for repose of late Rector's soul has been said in a parish church; and this has not been reproved but rewarded by the appointment of the officiating curate to the parish. This was done by parochial and diocesan authorities, the diocesan agreeing and adding a canonry to the rewards of the Mass performer. So much for churches. Now for the Divinity School in Trinity College, Dublin. It is reported that a guild exists among the divinity students, which enjoins clerical celibacy, and habitual private confessions; also that, in a Theological Society, essays first submitted to professors, are read in their presence and that of the society, essays which inculcate Popish doctrines. Nothing seems to be done to correct this Romish influence upon our youth. Next we come to the Church Press; that teaches a corporal presence with adoration of same as plainly as it can be put. All this being so, a pamphlet or letter has appeared, as coming from an English visitor writing to his friend at Oxford. This letter giving an exact account of all kinds of theology in Dublin, was distributed on the last day of the Synod to all the clergy present. This produced an explosion. The letter was said to be all lies, slander, etc. One of the fellows of the Trinity College, Dublin, having read all the charges about the guild and the essays, and the neglect of the divinity professors, denied nothing except some report about genuflections in the College Chapel. After a burst of rage from many speakers, Judge Warren stood up, and with calm dignity said he disagreed with most that he had heard. Exaggerations there were in the pamphlet; but there were truths bearing upon the Popish rites and doctrines coming into fashion. These truths, he thought, ought to be taken to heart by all concerned. So the incident ended. All Dublin is excited, wondering who the writer is, whether a Ritualist or not, Irish or not, lay or clerical—the first edition is all sold, and a new one in the printer's hands, which, besides the original letter, contains a second, stating all about the scene in the Synod, and ending with notes and letters copied from the papers, treating of the progress of Ritualism. This second letter, it is

thought, will spread as fast as the first, and both it is to be hoped will do good.

FRAGMENTARY THOUGHTS ON ORTHODOXY.

ORTHODOXY has been called fashion in opinion. Applied to such matters as opinion in literary and artistic affairs, it is not an entirely unjust definition. But even in them it is not mere fashion; and as to those more serious subjects, opinion in philosophy, jurisprudence, and religion, there are such differences between fashion and orthodoxy, as to disentitle them to be categorised together. Fashion derives its authority from novelty more than from aught else; orthodoxy cannot be orthodox without some degree of maturity; it is prescriptive. Fashion is whimsical; orthodoxy steady. Fashion can give no reason for its behests, nor can ever even profess a reason; orthodoxy claims to be based on reason, be its claim valid or not.

I describe orthodoxy in religion or science as the matured opinion of a generation beginning to be stereotyped in phrases. While opinion is in process of being formed, there can be no definite orthodoxy. And yet opinion never stands still. Even in the most stagnant periods of man's history, when there has seemed to be no progress, there has been some, of some kind and in some direction. The young grow old, and do not think exactly the same as they thought when they were young; new men are born, and they do not—indeed they cannot—think exactly alike as their fathers thought. The very words and proverbs which expressed a generally well understood opinion to one generation express an opinion differing, in ever so slight degree, to the next. Meanwhile, as generations succeed one another, no wisdom of any one age is ever totally lost; and each is the inheritor, no matter what use the wisdom may be put to, of all that has preceded it. But every age thinks, or the men of every age think, that they know better than any that went before them. It is true that they ought so to know; and it is true that there is not any permanent declension in anything, and that, while one age may not exhibit a real advance on that which went before it, no long succession of ages can maintain that stagnance. Even in dry ground plants spring up.

Let me limit the consideration of orthodoxy to the region of religious opinion. Orthodox men can give, as I observed above, a reason for what they think; and they can give authority. But their authority is not, commonly, the authority of the accumulated wisdom of all the ages, but of the wisdom only of that age, or that short series of ages, immediately previous. Its process of formation, if I mistake not, is this: the elder men of a generation which has arrived at a new truth—whether a new absolute or only partial truth—and who value it, and desire to pass it on unimpaired to their descendants and to their disciples' descendants, embody the truth in formulas and phrases; or the first generation of their disciples do it. The formula and the phrase come, through habit, through association, and through the natural disposition of men to idolatry, or to worship the image instead of worshipping that which the image is designed to represent—the formula comes at length to be mistaken for the truth it contains. The spirit is neglected,

and it becomes practically dead to those who discern the body only, or they become dead to it.

I believe that this is the history of many things among changes and progressions and regressions of opinion, and that many persons will recognise it as correct, if not exact. But it is only one aspect of orthodoxy, and perhaps not the most important aspect. For orthodoxy is not the loss of the truth; while it belongs to it, that it may exist in company with a loss of the apprehension of the truth. And it is also the case that those formulas which are the standards of orthodoxy, and without which to be able to appeal to it cannot have being, have frequently been used with success in calling back mere dry orthodox men from the worship of the letter to the recognition of the animating spirit. In other ways formulas, subject like all things to misuse, are of great value. They furnish records of the history of men's thoughts; they are, more often than otherwise, an assistance, in thinking and in teaching, to exactness of language, and inferentially to exactness of thought. But the taste for making them should be indulged very sparingly.

Orthodoxy is intellectually conservative. Most men are either incapable of wide differences of opinion from the society of which they are part, or indisposed to difference. All men feel that there is a presumption in favour of what exists. Those even who are capable, by genius, of originating new thought, and of pointing out old error that has been unsuspected for long periods, are not always the least influenced by the intellectual and moral tone of their surroundings. Frequently they are more so than men whose minds are more sluggish. Mere mental habit generally makes less impression on inactive thinkers than on the more original. Such persons accept an intellectual or scientific revolution, once that it is to some degree established, from the same conservative instinct that prompted them to resist it at first.

I speak not of that base orthodoxy, as professed, which aspires to be orthodox for the sake of being so; I speak of an honourable persuasion that the present age is the wisest that has been yet, and a reasonable and cautious shrinking from risk of loss of what has been inherited; feelings which are no shame to anyone. The opposite of that uncandid love of thinking in the prevalent fashion, which is so much to be deprecated, is the affectation of originality. At some periods one of these opposite vices is most usual, at some periods the other. Opposite as they are, they have much in common.

The moral ground and defence of there being such a thing as orthodoxy at all is, that men will have standards and authorities. If we could conceive all authority in matters of thought abolished to-morrow, a new growth of it would spring up the next day. If we could imagine all formulas suddenly dropping out of record and memory, it is impossible to think that they would not be soon replaced by others. The history of revolutions indicates this; and it shows us, besides, that new truth takes stronger hold on men's minds when grafted upon the old, than when forced on them in replacement of the old. He who likened the man instructed into the kingdom of heaven to a householder bringing forth from his storehouse things both new and old, was the same who announced of Himself that He had come not to destroy but to fulfil.

If men will have formulas and authorities, the fact of their requiring them may prove imperfection, but it does not prove, but rather the contrary, that they

are mischievous in themselves. That men should more or less submit themselves to authorities is not in itself slavish; it is a question of the more or the less, and a question of the mode of submission. While a man is a learner, he must defer something to his teacher; and the man who ever ceases to be a learner must be either a prodigy of genius or of its contrary. A man cannot run till he can walk first; and it is but a very few that can mount upwards, as on eagles' wings.

Has all this any practical use? I think it has. There is now no authority in the science of pure ethics; and there is no such thing as ethical orthodoxy. That science is now very prevalently denied existence; and it has made no progress since the time of Cicero, although a flood of light has been thrown upon it by the Christian religion. The theory known as Utilitarianism is not a substitute for the science of Ethics, but a denial of its possibility. It is possible that, were it otherwise, and that ethical science had maintained a place in men's minds, then utilitarianism could never have become a dominant theory; and if ethical science had continued to be studied, no matter in what manner, it must have had its authorities, its orthodoxies, and its heterodoxies. Perhaps it would have been ill cared for; but bad care is better than no care at all. Nothing human can exist without some kind of local habitation.

Z.

THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.

(Continued from page 187.)

CHAPTER IV.

IRISH MISSIONARIES.

It would be a mistake to suppose that Ireland at this period was entirely brought under the civilising sway of religion. Much had been done there, but as the country still lacked anything like a parochial system the monastic institutions, vast as was the benefit they conferred, yet could scarcely hope to reach and thoroughly subdue the masses of the people. The fame of the Irish schools was spread over Europe. Columba evangelised the wild Pictish tribes of Western Scotland, his example was speedily followed by hosts of missionaries who poured from Irish monasteries burning with zeal, into the defiles of the Vosges and the pathless mazes of the Black Forest.

Columbanus, a pupil of the school of Cluain-inis in Lough Erue, sought the monastery of Bangor, where he submitted himself to the rule of the eminent abbot St. Comgall. Thence, at the age of thirty, he set out with twelve companions to preach the Gospel in Gaul. Soon the monasteries of Anegray and Luxeuil sprang into existence, and the wild denizens of the mountain defiles saw before their eyes the example of what industry, toil and system could effect, while they saw, too, living examples of a holy blameless life. But Columbanus came into collision with Thierri, whose kingdom was virtually ruled by the infamous Brunehaut, his mother, who, in order to retain her influence in the kingdom, encouraged Thierri in vicious courses,

Columbanus denounced the sins of the court, and was expelled from Luxeuil.

He evangelised the Suevi, founded the monastery of Bobbio in Italy, in 613. Here he laboured till death closed his eventful career at the age of seventy-two. November 21, A.D. 615.

Gallus, or St. Gall, preached the Gospel in Switzerland. He taught the people residing on the borders of the Black Forest the arts of civilisation as well as the duties of religion, and was chosen Bishop of Constance when that see became vacant. But such honours were not in keeping with the self-denial, humility and asceticism of the Irish missionary, who declined the office, remarking that the canons did not allow strangers, except in urgent cases, to be consecrated bishops of districts of which they were not natives.

Aidan recovered Northumberland, Durham and the adjacent counties from Paganism. Finan converted the East Saxons. Killan founded the abbey of Wurzburg and evangelised Thuringia. Ireland gave as bishops to the English Church Aidan, Finan, Cedd, Colman and Diuma. Many an Irish Missionary has been overlooked from the common practice of Latinising names. Thus Siadhail became Sedulius, Donnchadh Donatus, Comgall Faustus, Fergal Virgilius. Enough has, however, been said to prove that in those early times, when darkness and idolatry reigned throughout Europe, the light of the Gospel burned brightly in the Emerald Isle, and when at last that darkness was dispelled the natives of our island were foremost in the work of civilising the nations of the Continent. Virgilius, bishop of Salzburg, was not only eminent for piety, zeal and missionary enterprise, but he has also left behind him the reputation of being an original and profound thinker. His startling views on the subject of geography provoked the suspicion and enmity of Boniface, the apostle of Germany, who accused him to the Pope because he "affirmed the earth to be a globe, that there were people on the other side whose feet were opposite to ours, that they were not descended from Adam and Eve, and received light from another sun and moon."* The religion taught by those early missionaries was the pure Gospel. They inculcated the sufficiency of Holy Scripture as a rule of Faith, and its free use by the people. They dwelt above all upon the facts of the Bible—on the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, Judgment. They taught the practical duties which ought to attend a belief in those awful realities, and living as they themselves did in constant privation and exposed to imminent perils, they were potent and speaking witnesses of childlike trust in an ever-present and all-powerful personal God. But although we can trace in the lives of our Continental missionaries at this period indications of the growing influence and pretensions of the Roman see, we do not find any trace in the records of Irish mediæval evangelists, which would lead us to conclude that the Irish Church then recognised or submitted to the supremacy of the bishop of Rome. On the contrary, the Irish Church differed from Rome on several points, such as: The time of keeping Easter; the tonsure of the clergy; the celibacy of the clergy; liturgy; and when those who favoured the Roman use assailed the Irish Church because of this divergence, her sons fought for their own views

with a dogged determination that was not finally broken down until Irish orders were called in question and Irish bishops came to be viewed with suspicion as schismatics. Columbanus, in his fifth letter to Boniface IV., administered some sharp advice to the Pontiff, and attests by his outspoken boldness the free spirit that still survived in that Church which, as it was the first to evangelise the nations of Europe, so also was the last to submit to the spiritual domination of the see of Rome.*

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND THE MASS.

SIR,—The Romish doctrine of the Mass is that it is a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the elements that constitute the sacrifice there is contained the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of our Lord. The doctrine of transubstantiation is, that the elements are physically changed, in substance, at the moment of consecration, into the actual Body and Blood of Christ; their accidents remaining unchanged. Romish theologians, and the Romish standards, the Decrees of Trent and the Creed of Pope Pius distinguish between these doctrines; and although, colloquially, "the doctrine of transubstantiation" is used to include the doctrine of the Mass, no commonly educated Romanist would think of calling it paradoxical to say that they are not the same, but distinct.

I do not know how old the doctrine of the Mass is; it is so easy a perversion to turn a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," a memorial thank-offering, into a propitiatory sacrifice to put away sin, that I apprehend it would be impossible to fix any date in the history of doctrinal development, at which the perversion had its origin. But the doctrine of transubstantiation is different. It was put forward first by Paschasius, a monk of Amiens, early in the ninth century; in the terms, as nearly as they can be put into modern English, that a physical change in the elements was produced in the act of consecration. The doctrine spread, not without opposition; much valuable controversy on the subject is preserved. During the eleventh century the new theory overpowered the old one; and at the Lateran Council of 1215, it was adopted as part of the body of the doctrine of the Western Church. I believe that it was then, or a little earlier, that the term *transubstantiation* was introduced.

The origin of the term was in this wise: The eleventh century saw the beginning of the great Nominalist and Realist dispute; a dispute that was not finally closed till Bishop Berkeley disposed of Realism. The Realists held that, given a piece of matter, say a brick, with its sundry qualities of colour, hardness, consistency, weight, magnitude, and so on, which qualities were termed *accidents*; and given,

* Virgilius is called by the Four Masters, "Fergel the geometer."

* See Bede, "Ecc. Hist.," ii. 4-19, iii. 3, 4. Gieseler, "Ecc. Hist.," ii. pp. 164, 5. Wordsworth, "Church of Ireland," p. 74. King, i. p. 304; iii. Appendix No. 2. Hardwick, "Church History, Middle Age," pp. 14, 15 and notes. On the learning of the Mediæval teachers see Mosheim, "Ecc. Hist." (Soames's Edition), London, 1859, ii., p. 151.

that the brick shall be deprived one by one of all these accidents; yet there must still remain the *substance* of a brick; the *substantia*, or that which stands under it. The Nominalists maintained that there was nothing of matter but its accidents.

It may seem strange that the most sensible men of Europe, during many centuries, should have engaged their wits in discussing such three-halfpenny and unmeaning stuff; and equally strange that when Berkeley finally disposed of the Realistic nonsense, there should have been found a great many sensible people, it is even attributed to Dr. Johnson, who said that he denied the existence of matter at all. The reason that interest attached to the controversy was, that the Romish theologians saw in the Realistic contention a way by which the theory of the physical change in the elements (of the Holy Eucharist) could be made tenable. Men's eyes and hands showed them that the accidents of the bread and wine remained as they were; but there was no such evidence of the senses to show that the substance of the bread and wine was not changed into the substance of our Lord's flesh and blood. In other words, the assumption of there being this thing called substance furnished an excuse, plausible to the minds of the people of the Middle Ages, and later, for asserting a change when there was none.

All this controversy, which in the time of the great Nominalist Abelard, agitated Europe, is now forgotten. The word transubstantiation, which could not have been invented before *substance* had been talked of, survives. But it conveys neither to Romanists nor to Protestants of the present time the meaning that it conveyed seven hundred years ago, and even three hundred years ago, to every one. When an average Romanist is now asked to expound the doctrine, he does so in the old language; but ask him to expound the old language, and it will be seen at once that he is using words to which he himself really attaches no meaning—he is repeating them like a parrot.

So long as Protestants believed in this fiction of substance, the difference in sacramental doctrine revolved round transubstantiation; for that included, inferentially if not directly, the doctrine of the Mass. But now that transubstantiation cannot be maintained on grounds that people will accept as philosophical, the real difference between the reformed Churches and those of the South of Europe is about the doctrine of the Mass. Is the Eucharist a propitiatory or a memorial sacrifice? And does the bread broken represent to us our Saviour giving up Himself as a Man, the Head of the human race, or as God? There are symptoms of the revival of the Romish notions among us; and those notions are quite as capable of being made thoroughly anti-spiritual as the exploded fictions of transubstantiation.

I am sorry to have had to make this letter so long; "Erigena" thinks that I speak unjustifiably. With submission to him, I think that I would be justified in using much stronger terms than I have used in reproaching the practice of forging quotations from books. B.

April 23rd, 1888.

THE NEW QUESTION AND ANSWER.

SIR,—“An Old Synodsmen” gives good advice, when he recommends abstinence from vituperation

and one-sidedness; advice which some of your correspondents who have accused the late Master Brooke and his friends of bad faith, heresy, little games, and absolute falsehood, might follow with advantage. I am unable to compliment “An Old Synodsmen” on his logic, as I must on his morals. He makes a distinction between *whereby* and *wherewith*; he receives *with* faith what is given *by* bread and wine. According to this, he would have been satisfied with the new answer in our Catechism, if that answer had diverged from the words of the 28th Article, and said in awkward English, that the mean wherewith the Body and Blood of our Lord are received in the Supper, is faith. In strange consistency (or the reverse) with this, he points out that the Latin word in the 28th Article is *quo*, which nobody would translate *wherewith*.

He thinks that the new question and answer are given more prominence than was their due. One might understand this if one were told in what part of the Catechism they should have been placed, so as to give them only their due prominence. But when he says that one is thrust into the position of the other, it is hardly possible that he can mean that the new question and answer are thrust into the position of those that define a Sacrament, for this is contrary to the fact; and yet I cannot conjecture what else his meaning is. He speaks of the contradiction in terms that was carried finally. Does this mean that there is a contradiction in terms between the Catechism and the 28th Article? So of confounding “whereby” and “wherewith.” How did our Revisers confound them, or how could they confound them, when they had only one of those words at their disposal? And how, finally, is, or can be, the accomplished change prejudicial to the very idea of a Sacrament?

Anger is certainly not argument; and, will your correspondent allow me to say, neither is it argument to make statements like the above, some of them unsupported by anything, and others reconcilable, in no way that is attempted to be explained with fact. Nor is it argument to call a careful revision of our Prayer Book by a number of as sober-minded men as ever lived, who spent over that revision a period of about six years, “panic legislation.”

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

21st April, 1888.

DR. LITTLEDALE AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,—I am accused of misquoting Dr. Littledale. The *Catholic Press* understood him, as I did: and I never heard that Dr. Littledale corrected it. But now I will give Dr. Littledale's words in full, and then your readers can judge. After other remarks, he says, p. 9 of “the Words of Truth,” “Whereas they,” Rome, “formerly taught that only mere phantasms of bread and wine survive after consecration; now the received teaching is, that no physical change whatever, of which the senses can take cognisance, is effected by consecration; but that all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist remain as they were before.”

2. “B.” says that I do not know the difference between “phantasms” and “accidents.” I plead guilty. I do not. Let him explain. I am all attention. I conceive both to be the taste, look, feel and smell of

the bread and wine. Rome taught formerly that these alone survive, and that no physical change of the underlying substance takes place, *of which the senses can take cognisance*, but that all the accidents of the bread and wine remain as they were before. This is exactly what she teaches now. If she has changed, let Dr. Littledale state the two creeds, old and new, side by side, that we may judge.

3. Having done with Roman doctrine, I now come to what Dr. Littledale says of our own. Having said that Rome teaches that though a physical change of the underlying substance takes place, yet that our senses cannot detect it, as all the accidents, of which alone our senses can judge, remain unchanged, he goes on: "This is the Anglican doctrine that *they remain* in their very natural substances." Now, that Dr. Littledale was speaking of the Roman doctrine, is plain, for he adds: "This is the Anglican doctrine, that they remain in their very natural substances expressed in other, but equivalent language." What does he say is expressed in other but equivalent language in the Black Rubric? Surely not "that they remain in their very natural substances," for these are the very quoted words of the Black Rubric. To say that the same words repeated are other but equivalent language, would be nonsense as well as falsehood, for they are not other but the same. He says then the Anglican doctrine is the same as the Roman, expressed in other but equivalent language. When he says that *they* remain in their very natural substances as Rome expresses in other, but equivalent language, he must mean the accidents by *they*—for Rome does not teach that the substances of bread and wine remain unchanged. So we are brought to this, that the Black Rubric agrees with Trent; and that all it means by saying that "the Sacramental Bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances," is that the look, taste, feel and smell, remain in their natural substances. This is astounding, as look, taste, etc., have no natural substances to remain in; and every one knows that substances in the language of both Trent and our Church, mean the inner substance, or *substratum* which the accidents clothe.

4. Dr. Littledale says that the Anglican doctrine is the same as that of Trent: "expressed in other, but equivalent language." We all know what Trent says. If ours is the same, then, of course, Dr. Littledale means what I accuse him of, though "B." denies the fact, that by "they remain in their very natural substances," he means that the accidents or phantasms remain.

5. "B." says I think transubstantiation and the Romish doctrine of the Mass the same. Most certainly I do. One he says, "rests on a metaphysical notion about substance prevalent during the Middle Ages, and now exploded." It is not exploded; or, if so in words, the conclusions founded upon it remain unchanged.

6. "B." abounds with polite complimentary allusions to me; but I am so accustomed to them that he must take my thanks for granted. At the bar they are always ignored, and matters of fact alone taken notice of. "You have a bad case, abuse the opposite attorney," is a standing rule there.

7. If Dr. Littledale's object was not to reconcile our Black Rubric with modern Romish dogma, is it not strange that the *Catholic Press*, as well as I, should so understand it. Mark the contempt and scorn with which the *Catholic Press* refuses his right hand of fellowship! Why is Dr. Littledale silent under such

contemptuous charges of dishonesty? But if it be true that such was his intent, then, of course, he meant to say that the Black Rubric, like Newman's theory of the 28th Article, accords with modern Romanism. If so, he must have meant that what the Black Rubric says, "remain in their very natural substances," are the accidents or phantasms, and not the substances of the bread and wine. Why, then, all this heat? This is all I said, *solventur risu tabula*.
AN AFFLICTED RELATIVE.

P.S. Perhaps "Presbyter" is thinking of transaccidentation; but if by a phantasm he means something without any accidents, he is no better off than before, for this theory taught that our Lord's Body retains its proper accidents, though miraculously hidden from our senses.

JACOB'S FRAUD.

SIR,—I have read "Presbyter's" interesting letter. Allow me to say a few words. God's purposes He can carry out in lawful ways. When men carry them out by forbidden means, they suffer the consequences. Take our Lord's condemnation as the first instance. Take the conduct of Joseph's brothers in selling him into Egypt, whither God intended in His own way to send His people. Jacob's crime was of the same kind. By fraud he snatched at what God could have given him in a lawful way; was not his whole life afterwards a series of chastisements? Had he not to humble himself before him over whom he had grasped at sovereignty? Was not the disunion in his own family treatment in kind for his wrong to his brother? Was not Laban's cheating of him, in the darkness of night, a just retribution for his cheating of his father in the darkness of blindness? Where is the difficulty in the story? God allows us to sin, He overrules our sin to His own purposes; He punishes our sin, He is not ashamed of what He does, He records it against Himself in His own book. The fairness with which He records the sins of His best servants like David, and the severity of their punishment, is one of the strongest proofs of the Divine authorship of the Bible. No false system would ever record things so apparently to its own disadvantage.
C.C.V.-G.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW." April, 1888. London: Nisbet & Co.

THE most interesting article in this number is one by Mr. Caffin, on the "Evidential Value of the Conversion of St. Paul." Much of that value consists in the subsequent change, rather than in the preceding vision. Mr. Caffin begins the article with an account of one of those remarkable visions, to the mere materialist wholly unexplainable, and which cannot be explained away by the easy hypothesis of imposture. He says:—

I was summoned late one evening to the bedside of a man whom I knew to be in an advanced stage of consumption. I had been visiting him for some weeks, and was well acquainted with him. He was about thirty years old, very ignorant; scarcely able to read. I had had reason to fear (and my suspicion proved to be only too true) that the woman with whom he was living was not his wife. I was surprised at his sending for me; up to that time he had seemed to take no interest in

religion; he was civil and respectful, but apparently apathetic and indifferent.

When I reached the house I found him not so ill as I had expected, but in a state of extraordinary excitement. He told me that he had had a vision: he had been assured of the forgiveness of all his sins; his soul was safe, his salvation was certain; he was inexpressibly happy; he had the sure hope of everlasting life with God. I knelt to pray with him; I began with confession of sin: he attempted to check me, gently, but decidedly. There was no further need, he said, for confession: his sins were blotted out, they were as though they had not been, and this, though he had that very day owned the sin in which he was living. He remained in the same state of extreme excitement during the whole of my visit, talking constantly of the revelation which, he said, had been made to him, full of assurance and exultation.

The next day I found him calmer; the fit of excitement was over. He lived for some weeks longer, but returned almost to his old condition; perhaps he was a little more open to religious impressions; he seemed to take a little more interest in prayer and Holy Scripture; but there was nothing now specially noticeable in his case. The influence of the supposed revelation had passed away; the man seemed to have forgotten it. Yet he was certainly sincere when he described it; in the state in which he then was he could not well have been otherwise; he was speaking the truth according to his light; that at least was certain.

The article containing an account of the late William Morley Punshon is very interesting. Punshon lived in days when lectures were popular, and he was one of the best lecturers. The writer of the article says:—

His first lecture, *The Prophet of Horeb*, was delivered at Exeter Hall for the Young Men's Christian Association. When the last sentence had fallen from his lips, the whole audience rose *en masse*, and cheered till it could cheer no more. An eye-witness states that, during the delivery of *John Bunyan*, at one of his magnificent climaxes, the vast concourse of people sprang tumultuously to their feet. Hats and handkerchiefs were waved; sticks and umbrellas were used in frantic pounding of the floor; hands, feet, and voices were united in swelling the acclamations. Some shouted "Bravo!" some "Hurrah!" some "Hallelujah!" and others "Glory be to God!" Such a tornado of applause as swept through Exeter Hall, and swelled from floor to ceiling, I have never witnessed before or since.

Professor Daniel S. Martin maintains that the evolutionist can also be a Christian. Of course he can. It is not the evolutionary theory, but materialism which is necessarily contrary to Christianity.

Other articles are on "The Self-Revelation of God," "The House of Esau," "Comparative Religion,"—ten altogether, making a better number than usual.

WE are informed that there has been considerable difficulty in carrying out the provisions of the Bishops' Act of 1878 in the case of Wakefield, but that the difficulties have been at last surmounted, and that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are now in a position to certify the fulfilment of all necessary preliminaries. There will still, however, remain the Order in Council creating the see, the Letters Patent nominating the Bishop of Bedford, the homage to the Queen, and the public investiture and enthronement at Wakefield, all of which must be accomplished.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Arnold, Rev. Henry E. B., M.A., Senior Curate of Horsham; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Oakley Square.
- Brook, Prebendary Arthur, M.A., Rector of St. John's, Hackney, London; Vicar of Almondbury, Huddersfield.
- Cann, Rev. D. M., Curate-in-Charge of Wear.
- Charlewood, Rev. George Sneyd, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Hales, Staffordshire.
- Cotes, Rev. W. E. H., M.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Hammer-smith; Vicar of Wythall, Worcestershire.
- Dyke, Rev. John Dixon, Vicar of St. James's, Camberwell; Rural Dean.
- Eieke, Rev. Kenneth Macaulay, M.A., Chaplain on the Bengal establishment, Lahore.
- Feltoe, Rev. Charles Lett, late Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, Professor of Latin, Junior Tutor and Senior Bursar of St. David's College, Lampeter; Head Master of the King's School, Chester.
- Ford, Rev. George Adam, B.A., Chaplain of Bengal, Calcutta.
- Forrest-Belt, Rev. J. H., Curate of Failsworth, Manchester; Chaplain to the Bishop of Washington, U.S.A.
- Garnett-Botfield, Rev. Charles Ramsey, M.A., Rector of Adwick-le-Street, Doncaster.
- Gatty, Rev. Reginald Alfred, LL.B., Rector of Hooton Roberts, Yorkshire.
- Gilbert, Rev. Wm., M.A., Vicar of Hogsthorpe; Vicar of Aston Magna, Worcestershire.
- Gordon, Rev. Charles Dickens, Rector of Walsham-le-Willows, Bury St. Edmunds.
- Harper, Rev. Alfred Mussendine, B.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Northampton.
- Haslam, Rev. Herbert Kingdon, B.A., Rector of Wakerley, Stamford.
- Hind, Rev. W., Rector of St. Peter's, Dorchester; Metropolitan and S.E. District Association Secretary of the Colonial and Continental Church Society.
- Holden, Rev. H. E., Vicar of Langtoft, Lincolnshire.
- Holmes, Rev. Edward, B.A., Rector of Barrowden, Stamford.
- Hughes, Rev. W. O. M., B.A., Curate of Houghton-le-Spring; Rector of Tarporley, Cheshire.
- Jones, Rev. C. J., M.A., Rector of Staunton, Gloucestershire.
- Kingdon, Rev. Frank Hawker, Vicar of Bridgerule, Devonshire.
- Mortimer, Rev. Brooke Cunliffe, M.A., Vicar of Hadnall, Shrewsbury.
- Pattison, Rev. Julian, Vicar of Christow, Devonshire.
- Postance, Rev. Walsham, M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Toxteth Park, Liverpool; Vicar of Christ Church, Willaston, Chester.
- Ridsdel, Rev. T., Rural Dean of Himley.
- Robinson, Rev. Joseph Armitage, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bath and Wells.
- Seeley, Rev. Henry, Secretary of the Christian Vernacular Education Society; Curate-in-Charge of Felixstowe.
- Smith, Rev. William E., B.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor, and Inspector of Naval Schools; Rector of Wark, Northumberland.
- Swindell, Rev. Thomas Greenall, Vicar of Sedgley, Staffordshire.
- Byron, John, M.A., Vicar of Killingholme and Habrough, and for many years Rural Dean, at Bath, on the 22nd inst., aged 71.
- Deans, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of Melbourne, Derby, for fifty-seven years, on the 20th inst., aged 84.
- Mooney, Rev. Thomas Plunket, Vicar of the parish, at St. Denys, Southampton, on the 19th inst., aged 53.
- Morris, Rev. Henry, at Witheall Rectory, Louth, on the 17th inst., in his 57th year.
- Pusey, Rev. William Bouverie, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 19th inst., aged 77.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.



The Church of England Pulpit.

REPENTANCE.

BY THE REV. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A.,
ENGLISH CHAPLAIN AT GOTHENBURG.

SERMON PREACHED AT GOTHENBURG, ON SUNDAY,
JANUARY 22ND, 1888.

"Except ye repent."—LUKE xiii. 3.

AS MAN of "one idea" we affect to look down on; yet not always wisely. The one idea as we call it may have endless amplifications. For instance, the Commander-in-chief of an army is for the time being a man of one idea, that of outwitting the enemy; but this is only to be done by making the one idea show itself in an endless succession of most varied actions—all disconnected and useless until looked at from the point of view of him who holds the key of all in the one idea he has formed.

As knowledge of this world's—aye, and this universe's—order and nature increases, as the secret springs of life—the life of human history, the life of human souls, the life of living forms; as all this life power becomes known in its limitless extent and unceasing development; so step by step is the explanation of all seen to lie more and more in simplicity and unity of origin, until it has come to be a not hopeless thought to anticipate in the lifetime of the present generation, some sight of a universal Law of Life.

Truth, in short, seems to be more and more manifest as absolute simplicity; the bewildering images of thought begin to shape and order themselves as one central idea is approached. The one idea may prove capable of holding in its grasp all the facts of all time and all space.

Friends, this is anticipated, as apparently every true thing is of whatever kind, in the thoughts of the Eternal Word of the Eternal God. Christ Jesus was a man of but one idea. This is a most solemn truth; the Son of Man took but one view of life—and never saw another possible. You perhaps can pride yourself on the many views of life you manage to take. When you watch the fluctuations of the money market, you view life from the stand of a man of business. You leave your office and meet your friends at the hospitable board; your view now is that of a social being. You retire to your family, and rejoice perhaps in the pure happiness of the home; you are the family man, the father, the brother, the son now. Or again, you open your Bible; you kneel and pray; you appear here to join in the worship

Vol. XXV.—No. 645.

of God, and you at such times view life as the Christian and the man with a soul to be saved, and a heart to be enlarged with the knowledge of the infinity and greatness of the love of God. Thus you are a man of many ideas. But so living there are—you know it when you think carefully of it—there are certain strange gaps and breaks in the continuity of your being, and a lack of unity which means a lack of power.

Contrast with this the marvellous power and unity of the few rarest men of the earth; above all, contrast it with the most powerful life you know of—that of the Christ—and see if it is not true, as I say, that that life had but one idea in it, and that that gives us the key to it all. Of this our Lord speaks before Pilate. He sums up the purpose of his life—the end and aim of all His work thus: For this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness of the truth.

To-day I wish to speak only of one single application of this one central idea. To ask, in fact, how did the world and the world's life, and the world's men and women and their life appear to Jesus? How did He bring His one idea to bear upon the infinite variety of its needs? At first sight it certainly would seem as if Christ had many answers to this question—to be given according to circumstances. Between one part of His teaching and another; between His conduct here and His conduct there, it might seem there were gaps impossible to fill up, until and only until we get to His centre, when we see the harmony of perfectness.

Christ's life had this end—"to bear witness to the Truth." Looking at men's lives from that point of view, from which He could alone consent to see them, He looked at but one thing—He had but one question: How do they stand now, at this moment, in this their work, this their pleasure, this their latest thought—how do they stand *now* towards God their Father? No incident was too trifling, none too far off, to be reduced to the one principle.

Ah, friends! There now opens before us a view of a sadder thought which I must press home upon you as my Master did. We may find the answer to that unceasing question in the unceasing word of warning and entreaty, which in many forms and under many figures, the Saviour of men steadfastly forced upon the consciences of all. "Except"—it is all there: it is just on the one word that I beg and pray you to notice how much hangs. "Except ye be converted," "except ye repent," "except a man be born again," "except" the strong man be bound, "except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees," "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." So it runs—the one simple truth so weighty with force and meaning,—so it runs through every word

He utters, this fateful, terrible, stern condition. It cuts with its sharp edge the life of this humanity in two, like the dark mysterious thread of life which divides creation into the two great classes—the things that have life, the things that have not life; like that other dark mysterious force we call death, which with a touch parts those who have lived from those who still do live; like the voice of the everlasting Judge severing with one word the things that are good from the things that are evil; aye, my brethren (to bring the whole matter to the test), like the silent working of the unseen, unknown line—it is here, it is now held in the hand of God!—which is day by day and hour by hour dividing the children of men into those who know God and those who know Him not. So does there lie wrapped up in this one word of our Christ's, the whole vast difference between the natural man—the mere fallen child of nature, the wrecked and broken fragments of a once glorious temple—and the renewed man, the spiritual man, the heart restored to the knowledge and love of God: all the difference between those who are "in Christ," and those who are where nature placed them—"in the world."

Except some new condition is found; except with some change in the relationship of the souls before Him with the spiritual realm; except that which is natural and common to all, gives place to that which is not natural, and even to be perceived but spiritually; except you, and they, and I get by some means across this line drawn through life by our blessed Lord, and change this "except" of the future into the "until" of the past, the sound of this word is fearful. There it must remain as the voice of doom and judgment upon us—as the pitying but rebuking warning of Him who alone is the Saviour bidding us fly from death to life, and showing us where only the door to life lies open.

And I repeat that this is the outward manifestation in the direction of the world at large of the one idea of the Lord Jesus. And for this reason. The whole matter of the Gospel lies summed up in the words "repentance" and "conversion." Repent means simply think differently—look at life from a new point of view—regard it under the conditions made manifest in the work and words of Christ. Surely, therefore, unless we do *repent in*, and *turn back with* (or be *converted to*) Christ, we miss the purport of His Gospel. That seems to me to have the simplicity and accuracy of a mathematical statement.

And this can easily be seen to underlie the whole Gospel moreover. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus reveals the glories of the moral kingdom of God. *Naturally*, we prefer a morality not so deep and not so heart piercing. But Christ calls you to repentance—to think differently in this. On the other hand, again, the parable of the Prodigal Son, for instance, shows the wild wanderings and madness of sin. Ah, friends, how

the dear Lord pleads with you there to wound the Father's heart no more, but with penitence and confession and humility of mind, return to the home of your soul. There is the repentance from sin which is the centre and basis of all. Again; when Jesus fed the hungry with unexpected bread, He called for their hearts' gratitude to lift them up to a vision of the true Bread of Life—the meat and drink of the lovable will of God. And when, again, He surrendered Himself to the death of the cross, it was still with this one thought, this one purpose, that He endured all—to win your soul, friend, and make His life possible in your life. Except ye repent, except the natural fear of the blood of the Cross—yes, my brother, I speak the words of truth and soberness—the natural fear of the blood of the Cross, give place through repentance to the spiritual love of the blood of the Covenant of God, it is all outside and beyond you. Except the sight of the Sin-bearer make you repent of your sins past—turn from them, hate them, confess them—its power and its merit alike pass reluctantly by you.

But now see in another way how this thought of Christ's comes up at all times: see how it simplifies life for us.

The best instance I can find is that account from which our text is taken. A cruel fate befell some Galileans, and about the same time an accident threw a tower in Siloam upon certain men and killed them. To us these two incidents would suggest various reflections: the cruelty and barbarity of the Romans, or the natural desire for vengeance; the shortness and uncertainty of life, or the harshness, perhaps, of Providence; or, as with the Jews who spoke to Christ on the subject, the guilt of the sufferers; perhaps even, to some, a pious thankfulness for being spared. To Christ there is but one unmistakable moral to be drawn: *You—you—you—where is your life?* Is it safe and secure beyond all the reach of all the changes and chances of the world? The world passes away—is daily, hourly, perishing, all are to die one day or another. The when and the where matter little, the *how* is the only question. Is your life at this moment, now while I speak to you, a true and God-given life? "For except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Death is a grand and useful standard to measure life by: it should be the climax, not the ruin of the life.

Do you urge, friend, that such solemn words are only for the utterly wicked, and not for baptised and orderly Christians? But our Lord shows most clearly that you are not right if you so think. His most trusty Apostle, the great Peter—long after he was baptised, nay after the great Confession which makes Peter stand out as a hero of faith, Christ says to him—"When thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." It was to His disciples, baptised by John, that He said, "Except ye be converted and become as little children."

For, great as is God's mercy in calling us to the state of salvation in which we are placed by membership in the Church of Christ, yet that can be of little avail unless we have in us the life which, coming from the Head, transforms and sanctifies. On the vine of God are branches good and branches bad: all branches, mark you, but only true branches, living and worthy, when bringing forth fruit. "For every branch in Me," says Christ, "that beareth not fruit he taketh away": it is cast forth and is withered.

No! it is not your life blood "mingled with your sacrifice"; it is not "the towers of Siloam" falling upon you in your peace and prosperity which make the fearful things of life; it is just this one thing—sin; the carelessness, the pride, or the worldliness of heart which stands outside the kingdom and will not enter in through the door of penitence and humility and faith. Except ye repent the heart steels itself in pride; except ye repent the cancer of sinfulness eats further and further in. Except ye repent the kingdom of God is not even visible to you. Except ye repent and come near to this Teacher of men you must see life lie crooked and false before you. Except ye repent and lay the load of iniquity (which He sees weighs you down to earth and to death) at the feet of the Saviour who loved you and died for you, there must still be that dark cloud resting on you and hiding from your eyes the light of the Sun of Righteousness. "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." Which may God in His mercy forbid!

Let His grace prevail! re-think your life—think it from Calvary's cross, think it from the mount of the Sermon; think it from the hill of Zion—the Lord's city, and let not the tears of the strong Son of Man ever burn into your hearts the brand of condemnation; let Him not weep over you as over the city which repented not at all His preaching and noble deeds, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." "I would . . . and ye would not!"

AN EASTERTIDE SERMON.

BY THE REV. H. HEBER EVANS, B.A.,
LATE VICAR OF MAPPERLEY.

PREACHED IN HOLY TRINITY PARISH CHURCH,
MAPPERLEY, DERBY.

"The Lord is risen indeed."—ST. LUKE xxiv. 34.

EVERY time that we repeat the Creed we say that we believe that Christ, after being crucified, rose again from the dead. What grounds have we for this belief? Such an event certainly does not appear to be in accordance with the ordinary laws of Nature. And our own experience

can give us no help; for we have never known any one come back over whom the grave has once closed. Those who have passed from earth into the eternal world do not return to us. No voice ever reaches us from that silent shore. And yet the Christian boldly says, Sunday after Sunday, "I look for the Resurrection of the Dead."

The sect of the Sadducees, of those who say that there is no resurrection, is not extinct. Many in our own time, and some in our own neighbourhood, like the Athenians of old, mock at the Resurrection. But recollect how our Saviour rebuked the Sadducees for this, "Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." (Matt. xxii. 23; Acts xvii. 32; Mark xii. 24-27). And so, notwithstanding the arrogant claim to all wisdom on the part of the modern man of science—science, which, after all, is only "falsely so called" (1 Tim. vi. 20)—in spite of the contemptuous scoff of the nineteenth-century Sadducee, the true Christian will not give up this vital part of his belief. He knows that this wonderful account of Christ's Rising from the Dead is no idle tale, as even the Apostles themselves at first imagined; and that he has followed no cunningly devised fable in believing and obeying the Everlasting Gospel (Luke xxiv. 11; 2 Pet. i. 16).

While faith is the great faculty needed to discern and receive spiritual things, we must remember that faith is founded, not on fancy, but on reason. Indeed, just as love is the highest exercise of life, so faith is the very highest exercise of the very highest reason, and is totally opposed to that silly credulity which readily listens to every whisper of fancy, and to every tale of superstition.

The Christian can give—thank God—a reason for the hope that is in him—that blessed hope of a better life, made known to him by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (Titus ii. 13).

Although the resurrection does not seem to be in accordance with the laws of Nature—and certainly the dark and awful mystery of death does, at first sight, appear to be the utter destruction and the hopeless end of life—yet, if we take the trouble to look and to listen, there are hints and strange whispers about the Resurrection, even in Nature herself, which, if they fall short of absolute proof, at least are most suggestive to all who have the ears to hear. Does not Nature herself every year act her great Parable of the Resurrection, that common earthly story with the blessed, heavenly, spiritual meaning? Does not Nature act her great Parable of the Resurrection every year before the eyes of all, wise and foolish, Christian and infidel? Does not all, or almost all, vegetable life die in the Winter, and does not the earth appear barren, desolate, dead; and yet we know that when the glad Spring comes round again, all Nature will rise from death, and burst into bright, fresh, joyous life. Is nothing suggested to the thoughtful mind by the clear light of day being overcome by the

darkness of night—the daylight dying away into night—only to reappear with renewed brightness in the morning? Does not the corn of wheat sown in the ground die, before it can rise to new life, and produce the golden grain of the harvest, for bread to strengthen man's heart? (John xii. 24; Ps. civ. 15).

And to pass from the vegetable to the animal Creation, does not the common caterpillar crawling on the ground, first die into the cold, repulsive chrysalis, ere it rises to a new life and flits through the summer sunshine as the beautiful butterfly? These facts, written in the book of Nature, and written large and plain so that all who choose may read them, show that to the Power that created Nature and this earth on which we live—a Power which thinking men must acknowledge to be an intelligent Power—a Mind as well as a Hand—to that Power and Mind the idea and thought of resurrection is no unfamiliar thought—no strange, unknown idea. What I mean is this, all Creation is the expression of the thought of the Creator. The book of Nature is a book in which you may learn something of the mind of God, and in that book of Nature one striking page—one great thought—is that of Resurrection, of death followed by renewed life. There is the principle and fact of the Resurrection in Nature. And all Nature is one. Rising again to renewed existence is to be found as a golden thread running through the manifold works of Creation; is not that, if not a promise, at least a prophecy, a foreshadowing of our own Resurrection? Are we men who, though sinful and mortal, stand at the very summit and pinnacle of all Creation, the noblest of all the wonderful works of God; are we men to be the only part of God's Creation shut out from the blessing and benefit of resurrection?

If the dead rise not, if Christ be not risen, then is all Creation a failure; for we men, who are at the head of God's creation, are indeed made for nought (1 Cor. xv. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 46); and all the marvellous power, forethought, skill, wisdom, and goodness displayed in the works of creation have been spent in vain. Does not this conclusion, which the infidel asks you to accept, proclaim its own falseness?

Do you really in your heart believe that the Living God who made the sun and moon and stars and earth, gives us fruitful seasons, and sends so many fresh human lives into this world every year, merely that they may die—only to fill the earth with graves, and to make His beautiful world one vast burial ground full of dead men's bones? If you can, indeed, believe that, as the infidel with his plausible tongue would have you believe it, you are in truth more the victim of a foolish credulity, than the most simple-minded Christian who has ever lived.

If you will only take the trouble to think, you will find that Christ's Resurrection and our Resur-

rection in Him, is the only reasonable explanation of all the dark doubts and painful mysteries among which we live and move in this strange world of ours. It is the one mystery that is the master-key to all other mysteries.

But turning from Nature, which will only disclose her secrets to those who study her open page with reverence—in a very different spirit to that of the scoffing infidel or arrogant scientist—turning from Nature to mankind, what do our own hearts and minds teach us? God has not only written His Name on the leaves of the Book of Nature, but He has also stamped His own Name and Character deep within the heart and soul and conscience of each one of His intelligent creatures. If we look within ourselves, we shall be sure to see some image or reflection of our Maker, however dim or imperfect this may be (Gen. i. 27).

We baptised Christians say, Sunday after Sunday, "I look for the Resurrection of the Dead." And the infidel loudly and confidently replies: "There is no Resurrection of the Dead—no other and better life."

Is the grave, then, which, as we can see for ourselves, is the house appointed for all living, to be indeed the final goal and end of human life? (Job xxx. 23). Does death indeed end all? Is there nothing beyond? Is death indeed to swallow up all the grace and beauty, all the talent and virtue, all the love and affection, which, for all these thousands of years our Mother Earth has borne? Is this dull, unmeaning round of work and rest, of eating and sleeping, of care and trouble, to be all, indeed? Are these petty trifles of which so large a portion of our life consists, all that we are made for? Do not you feel deep within yourself a desire which nothing that this world contains can satisfy—which is at once the thirst for, and the proof of, Immortality?

Is this succession of day and night, summer and winter, seed-time and harvest, never to cease, and all to continue for no object?—only that men may lead a troubled life of toil and suffering, and then drop quickly out of sight into soon forgotten graves? (Gen. viii. 22).

Was it for this that the human body was formed, so fearfully and wonderfully made, with such evident tokens of forethought and contrivance impressed by its Maker on every part of its structure (Ps. cxxxix. 13); with its framework of bones, more than 200 in number, so skilfully fitted together that hardly any could be changed without marring the whole; with its wonderful system of veins and nerves penetrating to every part, and of muscles fitted for every kind of movement; with its great organs which maintain the flow of life, as the heart and the lungs; with its wonderful instrument for thought—the brain, and that which enables us to express to others the electric flash of thought within us,

namely, the vocal chords and all the marvellous mechanism of speech. Was it for this that this wonderful machine, the highest visible work of the Creator (ten thousand times more wonderful than the most perfect steam engine) was constructed—to live to no purpose for a few fast-flying years, and then to die, be buried, and forgotten? Was it for this that the senses were given us, to enable us to learn many a useful lesson for this present world, only that just when we had mastered all, we should then fall back into the nothingness out of which we came?

Was it for this that the mind was given us, with all its wonderful powers and faculties of perception and imagination, of reason, memory, and reflection?

Again, why should conscience so sorely trouble us, if there be no life beyond the grave—and yet Shakespeare only stated a world-wide truth when he said: "Conscience doth make cowards of us all." A bad man has sometimes escaped in this world the outward punishment due to his misdeeds; but no sinner ever yet escaped the gnawings of remorse, or the stings of a guilty conscience, the dark shadow cast on the immortal soul by the judgment to come. Why should this be, if to die is the end of all existence? What can there be to fear, what can there be to trouble the conscience—indeed, how comes there to be any conscience at all to be troubled?

Are all the warm affections of the heart to be extinguished in death? Is there no comfort for the mother who has lost her little one? Was all that mother's love first implanted, and then drawn forth for nothing? We must instinctively reject so hopeless a belief. Are those whose bodies we have, since last Easter Day, laid to rest "within the Church's sacred shade," swept out of existence, unable any longer to love, or to be loved; or do they live as spirits, in the hand of the great Father of Spirits, awaiting the glad Day of Resurrection, of which Easter Day is the prophecy and the promise? Though dead to us, are they not living unto God; while we, still in our earthly tabernacle, also live under the shadow of the wings of that same Father of Spirits, the Beginning and the End of all, who is Lord both of the dead and of the living? (Rev. i. 8; Rom. xiv. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 28.)

Are all the noble, earnest aspirations of our nature to be quenched in death? All the longings of our better moments after goodness, and happiness, and perfection, and immortality, and God Himself? Are all these a mockery and a delusion, never meant to be satisfied? Is all the grievous wrong that is daily done on God's beautiful earth never to be redressed? Is cruelty, oppression, injustice, never to cease? Is evil always to triumph over good? We have the idea of justice planted deep within our hearts; but a child can see that in this life we cannot always obtain strict justice. Is justice, then, not to be had anywhere;

or is full justice, think you, to be done to good and evil in that other life beyond the grave, which Christ by His Resurrection has brought to light? (Acts xvii. 31).

Every true mother's heart, every thinking man's reason, every good man's hope, tell us of another and a better life. Let men say what they will, Death is not the end. There is the Resurrection yet to come. "Impossible!" do they say? "With God all things are possible;" "Incredible!" "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" Is this harder than creating the earth out of nothing, or than forming these present bodies of ours adapted to this present order of the world? (Matt. xix. 26; Acts xxvi. 8).

Would it not have been thought impossible 100 years ago to travel from Derby to London and back in a single day? and yet the steam engine has enabled us to do this. Would it not have been deemed incredible fifty years ago that men could send a message to America, 2,000 miles across the Atlantic Ocean, and receive the answer back in a few hours? This is now done every day. Would not any one have declared that we must be mad, if twenty years ago we had told them that they had only to speak, and the very self-same tones of the voice would be distinctly heard 100 miles or more away? Yet this is actually done by means of the telephone. Do not say, then, in this world and universe of wonder and mystery, that things are incredible or impossible. It is often that which seems most incredible and most impossible, that actually comes to pass. "With God nothing shall be impossible." (Luke i. 37.) The only question is what is the Creator's purpose; and God's will is that "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (1 Cor. xv. 22.) Would not people 100 years ago have said that any one, or all of these wonders, these miracles (for miracles they are) were impossible, and that those who believed in them were entirely deceived, if not utterly demented? Yet these wonders have all been proved to be true, and mostly in our own time.

And so, though hard-headed, shrewd men of the world, wise in their own conceits, may deem Christians mad to talk of such a miracle as the Resurrection—why may not the Christian's miracle of the Resurrection prove as true, and be as real a fact, as the scientific man's miracles of the steam engine, the electric telegraph, and the telephone?

Death is not the end. So much we can learn from the hints of Nature, the voice of Reason, the whispers of Conscience, the yearning of Affection. But we can do no more, and it is just here that Revelation steps in, and that the Church, the great Witness for God among mankind, declares that "The Lord is risen indeed"—that Christ who died on the Cross to take away the sin of the world is risen from the dead, and has abolished

death and brought life and immortality to light (John i. 29; 2 Tim. i. 10). This is the glad message of Easter to every one of us, that the Resurrection—without which this present life would be a hollow mockery, and worse still, an awful tragedy—is a fact, a sure and certain fact. That which men need and desire is just that which God has graciously appointed for them. That future and better life which we long for, and which our reason tells us there *ought* to be, and there *must* be, Christ's Resurrection as at this time tells us there is.

If Christ the Head of the Church be risen, that is the pledge that the Church, which is His Body, shall rise too. If Christ, the Firstborn from the dead, the Firstborn among many brethren, be risen, that is the prophecy that His brethren shall one day also rise; "but every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." If Christ be risen, "the first fruits of them that slept," that is the promise of the rising again of those we love, who have fallen asleep in Jesus (Eph. i. 22-23; 1 Cor. xv. 21-23; Col. i. 18; Rom. viii. 29; 1 Thess. iv. 14).

Are not the Scriptures fulfilled by the Resurrection of Christ? Is not the promise of God made to a thousand generations performed by it? Does it not satisfy the cravings of our own hearts—our unquenchable longings after immortality? Does it not bring glory to God as evidencing His power and mercy, His wisdom and goodness? Does it not bring the greatest blessing to us sinners who without it must ever remain in darkness and the shadow of Death? Does it not account for the growth of the Christian Church with its widespread blessings in the repression of wickedness, and the diffusion of goodness, kindness, and love? Does it not account for this, as nothing else accounts for it, because the Head of the Church is not a dead, but a living Saviour, who has encouraged His disciples with the promise of His presence even unto the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20).

Let us, then, cling to this great fact of our Blessed Lord's Resurrection. Even if we should refuse to believe this fact, this would not and could not alter it. "If we believe not and deny Him, He cannot deny Himself." Let us remember that as Christ was delivered for our offences, so He was raised again for our justification; and that thus the most sinful, on turning from his sins, may rely on a free pardon for Christ's sake (2 Tim. ii. 12, 13; Rom. iv. 25; 1 Tim. i. 15).

Let us die with our Saviour to sin, to all that is wrong and contrary to God's will and word. Let us rise with Him to a new and better life of penitence, and faith, and love, and obedience—a new life bringing forth the fruit of good works to the glory of God's holy Name (Rom. vi. 3, 4). Let us, being risen with Christ, seek henceforth those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God (Col. iii. 1). Let us print deeply on our

hearts and lives this great truth, that Christ is risen. We worship a Risen and Glorified Saviour, a Saviour who out of pure love died for our sins, but now for evermore is alive to make intercession for us. Death hath no more dominion over Him. Our High Priest was once tempted as we are, and is now touched with a feeling of our infirmities, and is able and willing to help us in every time of need. He is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him (Rom. vi. 9; Rev. i. 18; Heb. iv. 14-16; vii. 25).

If we abide in Christ by simple faith, and walk as He walked, live by His help a humble and holy life, death will have no power to harm us, we shall never taste of death (John ii. 6; John viii. 51, 52). The truth of this, our Saviour's gracious promise, has been proved by the happy experience of thousands and thousands who have lived a Christian life, and when that was ended, have peacefully fallen asleep in Jesus. Let us too live as His true disciples, and we shall, in God's own good time, and through our Saviour's strength, pass through the grave and gate of death to our own joyful Resurrection.

MR. MACKONCHIE'S will, which was dated January 20, 1886, has been proved by his brother, Mr. James Mackonochie, of the Inner Temple, and Mr. Charles Edward Jones, solicitor. Subject to the bequest of such of his books as the executors may think suitable as a remembrance of his affectionate regard for the Rev. Henry Aston Walker, the Rev. Arthur Henry Stanton, and other of the clergy working with him, the testator leaves all his property, the personalty being valued at £2,113 16s., to his brother.

WE are sorry to hear that the Dean of Chichester is lying very ill at the Deanery. When he returned from London, after delivering his Gresham Divinity Lectures, his medical attendant found that he had overtaxed his strength, and was suffering from overwork. Last Tuesday week he presented prizes to the boys of the Prebendal School, and on Wednesday he preached in the cathedral, but he did it with apparent effort, and he is now in a state of collapse. On Sunday he was prayed for at the cathedral.

THE DORÉ GALLERY. — Last year some 14,000 visitors availed themselves of Messrs. Fairless & Beeforth's invitation to view this exhibition, on the evenings of June between the hours of five and eight; but as many were unable to come at that time, these gentlemen have decided to renew their invitation to members of Young Men and Women's Christian Associations, Teachers of Sunday and Board Schools, for the same month and time this year. It is, therefore, requested that clergymen, ministers, superintendents, secretaries, etc., representing those desirous of availing themselves of this invitation, will write to Messrs. Fairless & Beeforth, 35, New Bond Street, W., before May 21 (enclosing stamped envelope for reply), stating the number of admissions required and the evening and hour most convenient, so that they may be enabled to arrange for the reception of their visitors, and issue the necessary free admissions.

Certain HARNESS Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
 FOR
RHEUMATISM
 Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh,
 writes:—"The Electropathic Belt has completely
 cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense
 agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."
 Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of
 Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the
 Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of
 Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on**
application to Mr. C. E. Harness, Consulting
Electrician, the Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
Only Address, LONDON, W.
52, OXFORD ST. (Corner of Rathbone Place.)
 Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 5, 1888.

THE PAPAL DECREE.

THIS has at last come forth. It condemns the Plan of Campaign and boycotting. It says that it is wrong to break voluntary contracts, that there are courts for regulating rents, and that funds are violently extorted from people for the Campaign plan. Boycotting, it says, is against the principles of justice and charity. Do not these matters come within the province of the clergy, and the Pope, their head? Surely they do, more than a man's election vote, which, in old times, it was said that the priest ought to guide him in.

Though all this is a part of morality, yet we shall be, we are, told that it is a mere political question, in which the Pope has no right to interfere. When the Pope issued his letter against the Parnell collection, Archbishop Croke showed his submission by subscribing £50, and his clergy their imitation of his good example by giving £1,500. It was written at the time, of this Simeoni letter, as it was called from the secretary's counter signature, that "as it came without authority, so it went back without respect," that it sounded more like an edict from the Castle. O'Connell, on a like occasion, said that he would sooner take his politics from Constantinople than from Rome. Politics evidently mean whatever it is convenient to call by that name. The Pope is warned that the Irish prelates love their people, their country, as much as they love their Church, that is the Pope; and that the Church is the people's, so that the people may do what they like with the Church's doctrine and discipline. What the Americanised laity will do with this letter we all know, even what Mr. Harrington or

Mr. Sullivan did with the vice-regal proclamation, that is, wipe their shoes on it! Dr. Nulty warned the Pope, when the see of Dublin was vacant, and it was feared that Dr. Walsh would not get it; and he told the Pope plainly that there was no divine promise that any national Church might not fall from Rome; that France, Scotland and England had done so, and that Ireland might do the same if thwarted; that the Irish are a haughty race, too, haughty, indeed, to do anything willingly but beg. We have said what the laity will do, viz., what the frogs in the fable did to King Log. But what will the priests do? Probably they will not appear openly against the Pope. Underhand they will do all they can to insult his letter. In this the bishops will back up their priests. Passive resistance and threats of a schism, with Croke or Walsh, as *Papa alterius orbis*, will be used against the Vatican. Thus things will go on, till it is seen what will turn up. Rome will delay and prevaricate, as she did with Henry VIII. and Napoleon. All our care should be to give the Pope nothing for his worthless support. Worthless it will be, for it will make the National party more bitter, because they will impute the Pope's act to the Norfolk, Errington and Brady influence at Rome. The victory will be gained, not by help from Rome, but by Mr. Balfour's sternness in carrying out unflinchingly all the sentences which the judges inflict upon rebels and murderers. Rome will try to get from England grants for popish universities and denominational education, instead of the National System. This the Pope will try to humbug England into giving in return for his banning boycotting and the Plan of Campaign. But let England know well that the coin he offers to pay her with, is as worthless as French assignats, or the greenbacks at their lowest. It is not worth a penny! So, if England grants him his universities and his denominational education system, she will have done it for a promise of help which is as worthless as a brass rap farthing. America, if she sees Balfour ruling Ireland, and Ireland trembling before him, will give no more money. The eighty-four rebel members will be starved out, and Ireland will once more return to peace and quietness, to be secured only by an Elizabethan and Cromwellian firmness, in ruling a nation, which is a terrible one to be afraid of, but which, like a nettle, may be safely grasped by the iron glove of authority.

THE DECALOGUE: ITS AUTHORITY IN IRELAND.

(Communicated.)

THIS is a most interesting subject of inquiry. When I say that the Decalogue has no authority, I do not mean that all its rules are trampled on. Some are in force: but, if they are,

it is not because they are in the Decalogue ; for, if so, all its rules would be observed equally. When one selects which to obey, and which to set aside, the authority is necessarily abrogated.

1. The First Commandment I will pass over. No one objects to that.

2. The Second is set at nought. When one image or picture is adored, rather than another of the same person, the second commandment is broken. Over a chapel door near Dublin there is an image of the Virgin and Child, and in an inscription on it, she is called "The Refuge of Sinners."

3. The Third Commandment is commonly broken in conversation. "Because of swearing the land mourneth." Perjury is awfully common. No one hesitates to swear falsely to save a Nationalist or a murderer. No one hesitates to go on a jury to decide according to his political bias. There is no regard for the sanctity of an oath, the cause must be upheld. All the perjury is to lie at the doors of those who compel them to swear. If they had not to swear, they would not commit perjury. It is to be feared that the priests set them an ill example in this respect.

4. The Fourth Commandment is held only to require an attendance at Mass in the forenoon. All the rest of the day is devoted to amusements and rebellious meetings, in the latter of which the priests take the leading part—rebellious meetings being held in the chapel yard, if not in the chapel itself. The yells of the people at their games make Sunday evening almost unbearable.

5. The Fifth Commandment. Children generally treat their parents with respect. If there is a difference as to politics, I suppose sons would take their own way. A Nationalist son, in going against a loyal father, would, I am sure, be encouraged by his priest. The treatment Norah Fitzmaurice has met with for swearing against her father's murderers, shows little regard for this commandment. Instead of being commended, she is persecuted, and people will not even pray with her in the chapel.

6. The Sixth Commandment has no force to protect the life of any one who is odious to an individual, or to the National party on political grounds. Such a one's blood is shed with as little concern as would that of a dog or a sheep. This commandment has no authority at all where politics are concerned.

7. The Seventh Commandment is obeyed or disobeyed, but in what degree is known only to the priests. All secrets sink there, as in a well, to rise only at the last day. Young girls marry early. Marriage throws a veil over all. There are two garments that none can pierce, the black robe and the matron's. About the time of the Union, the Irish Court was said to be most vicious. There was then a club in vogue composed solely of single men and married women. Given the spark and the

gunpowder, and unlimited opportunities, the end must follow. Man or woman who dares to complain of injuries committed by a certain class, must either be silent, suffer here, or fly the country. One party is always held to be the innocent victim. Whoever exposes him is the enemy of Christianity itself. The holy man must be cloaked over, no matter at whose expense. If through frailty he falls, the fault is not his, but the Church's.

8. The Eighth Commandment has no force as to rents, or any other debt that can be evaded. Honesty has taken its flight completely.

9. The Ninth Commandment has no force, where one's own interest is concerned. Lying, unless it is to injure anyone, is thought nothing of.

10. The Tenth Commandment relates to thoughts and wishes. Where the seventh or eighth commandment is violated, the tenth of course has previously fallen as an outwork, in chapel the people do not get any religious instruction. The sermon is all about politics. Catechising seems left entirely to the schoolmaster. The priest visits and signs a book, but never asks the children a question, I am sure he would think it beneath his dignity to do so. Nationalist training is all he cares for.

THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.

(Continued from page 201.)

CHAPTER V.

INCURSIONS OF THE DANES.—795 A.D. 1014 A.D.

WE have seen how Christianity superseded Druidism, we come now to a period when the Church of St. Patrick was confronted by a rival Church which, at first flourished side by side with the national Church, then gradually leavened it until finally both merged into one. At this time the septs were nominally joined together by a kind of federal union, but the pride, the turbulence and the rapacity of the different chiefs perpetually disturbed the island, which thus became an easy prey to foreign invaders. Those constant feuds were also a great hindrance to husbandry and tillage ; they checked the spread of education among the masses of the population. The country had not an extensive commerce, and what little there was suffered considerably from those intestine broils. Still, the country on the whole was prosperous, the law was administered with equity, the ecclesiastics as a rule were learned, pious and peaceable, the monasteries were nurseries of learning and piety, the schools of Ireland were the resort of the youth of Western Europe. A new era was, however, dawning for Ireland ; the saddest and the darkest in all her mournful history. In 795 the Danes made their first appearance on the Irish coasts. In that year they plundered the little island of Rathlin, or Rechlan, which lies off the coast of Antrim. From this period until 948 their incursions were constant, and they spared

neither class nor order, age nor sex. The monasteries and religious houses were the special objects upon which they vented their fury; they ravaged the seminaries and schools, plundered the monasteries, burned the churches, and murdered the clergy. Those rovers of the sea, called by the Irish Gall, or strangers, belonged to two nations: the Northmans, or Northmen, and the Ostmans, or Easternmen; the Northmans were Norwegians and Danes; the Ostmans came from the sea coasts of Germany. The supreme power in Ireland was now held by the two branches of the Hy Niall, who governed the country alternately. The northern Hy Niall ruled in Tyrone, the southern, or Clan Colman, in Meath. At first the Danes seem to have thought only of plunder. Their bands were again and again attacked by the Irish, and routed with terrible slaughter, but fresh hordes returned to renew the depredations, and the Irish were no sooner free from danger from their foreign enemies than they turned their arms against one another. Such was the condition of affairs when Turgesius landed in the island in 815.

The roving bands of the Danes now began to concentrate their power, and the incursions hitherto made for plunder, assumed the aspect of a permanent occupation of the country. The ruin wrought by those wild pirates was terrific. Thrice in one month Armagh was plundered. Cork was laid waste in 821. Bangor in 823, when nine hundred monks were slaughtered, and the rich shrine of St. Comgall was rifled. The famous monastery of Clonmacnoise was burned, and the same fate befell every shrine and seat of learning of any reputation in the country. Vestments, plate and sacred utensils were carried off, and the occupants slaughtered without remorse. Turgesius seized the supreme power, which he continued to hold until his death. He placed Danes in every post of authority, appointed Danish captains over the various districts, nominated princes from among his followers to rule in the provinces, imposed on every householder an annual tribute of an ounce of gold, and punished the non-payment of this tax with the loss of the nose, persecuted with remorseless severity monks and bards, whom he compelled to fly for refuge to the fastnesses and forests, and used his power with great cruelty towards the hapless Irish. Turgesius at last fell a victim to his cruelty. He cast longing eyes on the beautiful daughter of Melachlin, king of Meath, and demanded the maiden from her father, who felt himself powerless to resist the will of the tyrant. He promised to send his daughter, attended by fifteen of the most beautiful maidens in his kingdom. Turgesius, attended by fifteen of his chieftains, repaired to his castle at Loch Var to receive the Irish damsels. When the festivities were over, and the Danes proceeded to familiarities with the strangers, they discovered, too late, that the attendants were young men dressed in female attire, who each plunged a dagger into the heart of his would-be suitor.

The Irish rose everywhere against their oppressors and destroyed their castles. During those savage broils the cause of religion suffered severely. The clergy too often forgot their sacred office, and took part in the encounters, which, although begun, so far as the Irish were concerned, in self-defence, often ended in wholesale massacre of their opponents. In 853 occurred another remarkable expedition, undertaken by the three brothers Anlaf, Sitric, and Ivar, said to be of the blood royal of Norway, who landed in Ireland with a large band of adventurers. They

professed that their object was for purposes of traffic, and they established themselves in the three great central stations, Dublin, Limerick and Waterford, which soon developed under their control into considerable commercial activity. The Irish were not much given to mercantile pursuits, so that the Danes rapidly became masters of the whole trade of the country, and, as their power was continually receiving aids both of men and money from their own land, the Irish were every day lapsing more and more into a dependent condition.

To this age belong several ecclesiastics of considerable repute. Muredoc, Abbot of Kildare, dying in 821, was succeeded by Sedulius the Commentator, who was acquainted with Greek, Latin, and Hebrew. His commentaries are distinguished by sound sense and evangelical purity. But the most illustrious Irishman of the age was Johannes Scotus Erigena, a man of great eminence as a philosopher and scholar, remarkable too for personal piety, though his views were fanciful and even erroneous. Erigena was a constant guest at the table of Charles the Bald, and often disturbed the equanimity of his host by his quick repartee, which was occasionally more pointed than polite. On one occasion the king asked him as they sat over the wine cup: "John, what is the difference between a Scot and a Sot?" "Nothing but the table, please your majesty," answered the wit. Erigena died in France about A.D. 874: his principal aim was to effect a union between Neo-Platonism and Christianity. From the days of St. Patrick, seventeen monarchs ordained monks are said to have reigned in Cashel. In 901 Cormac Mac Cuilleann, bishop of Cashel, was elected to the throne. Cormac was a fair specimen of early Irish Churchmen. The "Psalter of Cashel" and the other literary works which he produced, prove that amid the cares of a more than usually busy life, he found time to cultivate literature. He was devotedly attached to religion, and though a bishop he was married. In his career again we notice the unhappy state of the country, which drove the monk and even the bishop to exchange the peaceful cloister and the quiet profession of religion for the din of arms. Cormac fell in battle in 908.

THE PRINCES OF LEITH.

Mogha strove fiercely against the princes of the Leath Cuinn, while the Danes plundered and oppressed both districts with impartial severity. These hardy rovers had become Christians in 948, but their conversion made little difference so far as the Irish were concerned, and their ravages continued to go on as before.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

DR. LITTLEDALE AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,—A few months ago a book was published, "Words for Truth; replies to Roman cavils against the Church of England," by Dr. Littledale. It is a book or pamphlet fully worthy of that eminent master of logic and erudition. It was attacked by a correspondent of yours, in two letters; attacked not honestly,

but with the poisoned weapon of forged quotations. I exposed your correspondent; and he, in to-day's PULPIT, comes forward without shame in a letter professedly justificatory of himself.

I have nothing to say to an impenitent forger. But for your readers' information, let me say the following: Your correspondent's attempt to show that Dr. Littledale means what he (correspondent) imputes to him is as utter a misrepresentation as if he used new forgeries to sustain his imputation; to the verge of which he approaches by distorting quotations. He says that the *Catholic Press* refuses with contempt and scorn Dr. Littledale's right hand of fellowship. This right hand of fellowship administers to Romish error and fraud a buffet that there is no Romish theologian who would not be glad if he were able to return; and the contempt and scorn of the reviewer in the *Catholic Press*, a vulgar ignorant person, is manifested in the remark that the best of Dr. Littledale's book is the binding.

The question, what is the difference between *phantasm* and *accident*, is a question of the same kind, as what is the difference between a moonlight night and a blade of grass? For difference to be predicated between two things, they must have something in common. A phantasm is something that appears only to the imagination. An accident of a thing is any quality of it whatever, capable of being lost, either actually or in supposition, as the savour of salt or the hardness of iron. People who have access to a dictionary should not ask such questions.

I do not attack your correspondent as a bad attorney or advocate, bad as he may be; I arraign him as a false witness. It is to me most difficult to understand how any person can be first unwise enough to fabricate extracts from a book, with every probability of detection, and next, so oblique-minded as to think that such a thing admits of justification, or even of the least excuse. B.

28th April, 1888.

JACOB'S FRAUD.

SIR,—In the PULPIT of the 21st, "Presbyter" has a long letter on the subject of "Jacob's Fraud" in depriving his elder brother of the inheritance, but gives no opinion on the really important question whether the story is true. I am an Evangelical believer, but, finding the story in a Hebrew book, I no more believe it than if I found it in a Greek one. To talk like "Presbyter" in such a connection about "the progressive character of revelation," seems to me dangerously near to saying that God is *not* "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." But from his also making the "distinction between inspiration and infallibility," I hope that "Presbyter" agrees with me in disbelieving the story.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, April 26th, 1888.

DR. KING'S PROFESSORSHIP AT DUBLIN.

SIR,—A most important theological professorship is at present vacant in the University of Dublin: that of Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity. The lecturer filling this professorial chair is expected to deal chiefly with current theological controversies; and to be able to wrestle with new objectors attack-

ing our theological standard, The Thirty-Nine Articles—whether these objectors be theologic, agnostic, or scientific. Any lecturer unable to meet such opponents could not discharge the demands of his office with honour to the University, or with credit to himself. Consequently, the selection of a candidate to fill the chair of Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity, is one that calls for great discrimination and independent action on the part of the Board of Trinity College. No ulterior aim than the real advancement of pure theological culture to the advantage of the students committed to her care, should influence Alma Mater in the choice she makes.

The times claim that some man of original thought and power to give expression to it, should be chosen. Modern phases of infidelity, subtle and ever varying, the exponents of which are men of marked literary skill, can only be met by men of original calibre, versatility of thought, and equal literary ability. Literary ability cannot be defined as penny-a-lining book-making, or scrap collating. Writers who do such work are in the position of the boy who slyly "cogs" a sum; he gets credit for doing the sum although he does it not. No Churchman of one-sided leaning, and no theologic fossil, but a living healthy orthodox specimen of the genus should be considered as fit and proper to the position in the case under question. To speak pleasantly, fossils are only good for examining, and to indicate the epoch when the fossil lived and imbibed its theologic nutriment.

The publications of the junior divinity professor ought to have the *imprimatur* of originality, and not be a mere collaboration or recasting of the arguments of Christian apologists of other days, good enough in their time, but wholly inadequate to the requirements of our generation.

The scientists of our day hold very little sacred which is labelled theology, and some of them go so far as to discard as not proved Bishop Butler's postulate, that there is an Author of Nature. The one great question of our time has, through the statements of certain scientists, become one of "God or no God." In proof I need only tender the extravagant lengths to which Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his destructive cast of philosophy, has pushed some of the conclusions of Hamilton and Mansel. Unable to meet Bishop Butler on his own ground, Mr. Spencer has declared, in his view of the Origin of things, that "It is not a question now of probability or credibility, but of conceivability." No man but one able to meet such objectors as Mr. Spencer, Professor Huxley, and their species is fit for the vacant Divinity Professorship in Trinity College, Dublin. No man except one who is endowed with the competent ability to write such a work say, as "Bishop Butler's position considered in the light of modern criticism," would be a suitable professor.

It behoves the Board of Trinity College to consider well that their institution is a competing one with Oxford and Cambridge, and must stand or fall according to its merits or demerits. Therefore *bonâ fide* capacity and genuine intellectual superiority ought to weigh down every other consideration with the Board of Trinity College in their choice of a professor. There are four of the Fellows highly competent for the position, namely, Doctors Abbott, Stubbs, Poole and Gray. Happily so able a theologian as Doctor Gwynn is not lost to our Divinity School, but meritedly gone up higher.

M. O. S.

A SCENE IN THE DUBLIN SYNOD.

SIR,—I have just read your article of the 28th, on the scene in the Dublin Synod (by which you mean the General Synod of the Church of Ireland: the *Dublin* Synod is the Diocesan Synod of Dublin. I was there when one of its members brought forward the subject of the pamphlet, "giving an account of all kinds of theology in Dublin"; and my report on the matter is, that most of the Synod thought he had been unwise in giving its author the advertisement which he wished for, and that the charges were, on the whole, too absurd to be worth a formal contradiction.

I will add my own belief, that the Church of Ireland is in no danger whatever from Romanism or Ritualism: that our danger is that which is always present, and will be till the end of the world—carelessness, worldliness, and unbelief.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 30th April, 1888.

 Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." May, 1888. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

A VERY good number of the *Expositor*; all the papers are good except Archdeacon Farrar's on the Apocrypha, which contains nothing worth preserving. The Archdeacon's passion for "piling up the agony" gets worse and worse: he cannot resist a big adjective; meaning is no matter.

Mr. Rendall's "Notes on the Acts of the Apostles" are very good; they are not mere snippings from commentators commented on—many are very suggestive, though we will not bind ourselves to agree with them all. Two of the best may be quoted:—

"V. 9. Ananias and his wife are charged with agreeing together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord. The Greek word *πειράσαι* is clear enough as including, besides temptation to evil, any kind of trial of the spirit within a man (compare 2 Cor. xiv. 5; Rev. ii. 2). So here Ananias and his wife are charged with having conspired together to try whether the spirit that was in the Apostles could be deceived by their false statements. But this is not expressed with equal clearness in the English versions."

"VII. 51. Our versions read, 'uncircumcised in heart and ears.' I suspect that *καρδίας* is the true reading, and that it was changed into *καρδιαις* in some MSS with a view to so rendering the passage. But supposing the dative to be genuine, it would be as inelegant to write this sentence as it stands in Greek, as to write in English 'uncircumcised in heart and in your ears.' The stop must surely be placed after *καρδιαις*, and *καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν* be taken as the beginning of the next clause 'Even with your ears ye do always. . . . Their fathers had refused to listen to Moses, and they were now stopping their ears against the voice of the Spirit, and setting themselves to silence it by violence; they had reached herein a climax of stubborn unbelief, even beyond what was expressed in an uncircumcised heart.'

Dr. W. L. Davidson's paper on Gal. iii. 19, 20, is not very clear. However, a paper on a text which boasts of more than four hundred interpretations,

perhaps may be excused a little obscurity; but either Dr. Davidson is confused, or else we are dull.

Mr. Herbert Stead has done a piece of very laborious work. He has tabulated "The chief Pauline names for Christ," showing how often and in what proportions they occur in each epistle. It is a paper to make a note of for reference, but we greatly doubt if this kind of statistics is of very much value. And least of all can St. Paul's epistles bear to be treated in this analytical way; their style is far too passionate. No man wrote more from the feelings and less from the intellect than St. Paul—his epistles have no flavour of the study table. However, we do not wish to undervalue Mr. Stead's labours; we will quote his own and only instance of the way in which his table may be used. "Take one instance. Pfleiderer maintains that Mark—which he regards as the first Gospel—was written by a Paulinist, who tinged the narrative so far as he could with Pauline doctrine, and sought to vindicate from the lips of the Master the Gentile Christianity of the Gentile Apostle. Now, is it likely that an author soaked *ex hypothesi* in Pauline literature, would rarely or never slip into the use of the most frequent Pauline name for Jesus. But in Mark the term *χριστός* has its full official significance, and has not become a proper name equal to *Ἰησοῦς*. Only once (ix. 41) is *χριστός* used by St. Mark in what is not necessarily an official sense."

Professor Bruce writes a second paper on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Dr. Wright one on "The Pre-Christian Jewish interpretation of Isaiah lii., liii."

"A HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT." By George Salmon, D.D., F.R.S., Regius Professor of Divinity, 3rd Edition: Murray, 1888. Pp. xxiv. 643.

WE heartily welcome this new edition of a most admirable work. The first edition appeared two years ago, or less. A second was very soon called for, and now we have a third. Every one who has studied the volume will rejoice that the learning, ability, and strong common sense in which it abounds, are becoming diffused so widely as this rapid sale seems to indicate. The editions are not mere reprints. The second edition contained an additional chapter of very great interest on the Non-Canonical Books, and there are several smaller additions in the volume before us. We hope that the gifted author, who lately left the Professor's Chair for the still more honourable post of Provost of Trinity College, will live to publish, if not to deliver, many more such lectures as he has in this work given to the public. Such a combination of solid learning with genial, and (at times) humorous persuasiveness, has seldom been given to the world. The main object of the lectures is to discuss the date and authorship of the Books of the New Testament on *purely historical grounds*; and the sobriety and sound judgment with which the whole discussion is conducted, are a model of what such discussions should be. We urge both those who know little, and those who know a great deal, about the subjects of which the lectures treat to procure and study this volume, for it is eminently a book to possess. The former will be instructed, and the latter delighted by what they read. Both will acknowledge that Dr. Salmon has solved the problem of making instruction in somewhat abstruse subjects not only

easy but entertaining. It is to be hoped that many Bishops and Theological Colleges will adopt it as a text book for those who are preparing for ordination.

Where all is so excellent it is difficult to pick and choose; but perhaps one of the most instructive lectures in the volume, is the one on the Acts. Dr. Salmon disposes in a masterly way of the attempts which have been made to assign the Acts to a writer in the second century. Admissions of adverse critics show that large portions of the Book *must* have been written by a companion of St. Paul, and it is impossible to sever these portions from the rest: and among all the known companions of St. Paul, no one fits the conditions of the problem better than he to whom the earliest and best traditions assign the Book, viz., St. Luke. Dr. Salmon, throughout the volume, is specially happy in showing that in some cases what at first sight looks like adverse evidence turns out, when carefully examined, to be favourable to the authenticity of the document in question: Thus the apparent contradictions between the Acts and Galatians, although not real contradictions, show that the historian when he wrote the Acts had not seen that Epistle. "If Luke had not been with Paul at the time he wrote that letter, then unless Paul kept a copy of it, or unless the Galatian Church sent him back a copy of his own letter, one of Paul's immediate companions was just one of the last persons in the Church to be likely to see it." Thus from the premiss admitted on both sides, "The writer of the Acts cannot have seen the Epistle to the Galatians;" we draw the conclusion, "Therefore he may well have been a companion of St. Paul, for a companion of St. Paul, if absent when the Apostle wrote, would be years before seeing the epistle;" and this is at least as probable a conclusion as "Therefore he cannot have been a companion of St. Paul," for a companion must have seen the epistle. Although he considers the case less strong, Dr. Salmon thinks it "probable that St. Luke when he wrote, had not seen the Epistles to the Corinthians. Surely if he had read 1 Cor. xv. 6, 7, his Gospel would have told something of our Lord's appearance to James and to the five hundred brethren at once; and if he had read 2 Cor. xi. 24, 25, the Acts would have given some particulars about the five times when in the synagogue Paul received forty stripes save one, of the three beatings with rods and the three shipwrecks." But we hope that our readers will take an early opportunity of studying this delightful book for themselves. Extracts give a very inadequate idea as to its value.

ON Thursday last the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, at their general meeting, sealed the certificate necessary to enable Her Majesty in Council to found the new Bishopric of Wakefield, as contemplated by the Bishopsrics Act, 1878.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Ahier, Rev. P., Vicar of Glaisdale, Yorkshire; Priest-in-Charge of the Collegiate Church of St. Faith, Clifton.
 Bentley, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Vicar of Bosbury, and Rural Dean; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Herefordshire.
 Briscoe, Rev. Samuel T., M.A., Curate of St. Thomas's, Portsmouth; Rector of Linwood, Lincolnshire.
 Broughton, Rev. R. F., Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cheshire.
 Bullock, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of Denton, Otley.
 Currie, Rev. U. P., Principal of St. Stephen's House, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely.
 Darrell, Rev. John Freeman, Rector of Hayford, Norfolk.
 Drakeford, Rev. Lewis Arthur, M.A., Vicar of St. John Baptist's, Newtown, Leeds.
 Edmondson, Rev. William, Curate-in-Charge of Farnworth.
 Evans, Rev. Richard, Curate-in-Charge of Llandaniel, near Bangor; Rector of New of Newborough, Anglesey.
 Freshney, Rev. F., Vicar of Skidbrook; Rector of Withcall, Lough.
 Grace, Rev. Allen Zachariah, Vicar of Wellington, Salop; Rector of Thwaite, Suffolk.
 Green, Rev. W. G., Vicar of Leaton; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen at Kensington Palace.
 Harvey, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Hounslow.
 Heald, Rev. Edmund, Senior Curate of St. Catherine's, in charge of the Whely Mission, Wigan; Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Bawtry, and Master of Bawtry Hospital.
 Hilbers, Rev. George Christopher, Rector of St. Thomas's, Haverfordwest; Surrogate of the Diocese of St. David's.
 Houghton, Rev. P., Curate of St. Mark's, Sheffield; Organising Secretary to the Colonial and Continental Church Society.
 Jameson, Rev. Thomas Edward, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Burmantofts, Leeds.
 Jones, Rev. David, Rector of Newborough, Anglesey; Rector of Menai Bridge.
 Jones, Rev. Herbert Edward, M.A., Rector of Knebworth, Herts.
 Lewis, Rev. David, late Vicar of Llangynfelin; Rector of Llanfair Orllwyn, Cardiganshire.
 Lewis, Rev. David, late Curate of Llanfihangel Penbedw and Capel, Colman; Vicar of Llansaintffread, Cardiganshire.
 Lewis, Rev. Richard, Vicar of Llanychaiani, Cardiganshire.
 Lloyd, Rev. John A., M.A., Vicar of Broad Hinton, Wilts; Grand Chaplain of English Freemasons.
 Longsdon, Rev. Henry John, M.A., Rector of Eyam, Derbyshire.
 MacCarthy, Rev. John, Rector of Langford-with-Ickburgh, Norfolk.
 Manning, Rev. Charles Upwood, M.A., Rector of Clenchwar-ton, King's Lynn, Norfolk.
 Martin, Rev. J. W., Curate-in-Charge of St. Margaret's, Ben-tham.
 Pullaine, Rev. Canon John James, M.A., Rector of Stanhope, Durham.
 Pope, Rev. Richard Massey, B.D., Censor of Unattached Students, Oxford; Grand Chaplain of English Freemasons.
 Simmons, Rev. Thomas Charles, M.A., Vicar of Granthorpe, Lincolnshire.
 Soden, Rev. Alfred James, Vicar of Hogsthorpe, Lincolnshire.
 Thomas, Rev. Owen Jones, Vicar Kiffing, Carmarthenshire.
 Williams, Rev. Thomas, to the District Chapelry of St. Mark's, Swansea.
 Woodhouse, Rev. G. G., Vicar of Yealmpton, Devonshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Barclay, Rev. H. A., of 11, Sussex Square, Brighton, on the 23rd ult., aged 55.
 Burges, Rev. R. B., twenty-one years Vicar of St. Paul's, Birmingham, at St. Paul's Vicarage, on the 25th ult., aged 60.
 French, Rev. William, M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor (Retired 1884), formerly of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and Curate of Harston, near Cambridge, at Cannes, Alpes Maritimes, France, on the 21st ult.
 Harrison, Rev. Edward Henry, after three days' illness, at Kington Vicarage, on the 24th ult., aged 46.
 Lloyd, Rev. George Newton, M.A., Vicar of the parish, and formerly Rector of Killesk, County Wexford, at Bicton, near Shrewsbury, on the 24th ult., aged 56.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE NECESSITY AND REASONABLENESS OF SACRIFICE AND MEDIATION.

BY THE REV. CHARLES RICHARD PANTER, M.A., LL.D., MEMBER OF THE SENATE, DUBLIN UNIVERSITY.

A SERMON ON THE ATONEMENT, PREACHED IN THE PARISH CHURCH OF NAUL, ARCHDIOCESE OF DUBLIN, ON GOOD FRIDAY, 1885.

"Though the analogy of nature is not an immediate answer to objections against the wisdom, the justice, or goodness of any doctrine or precept of religion, yet it may be, as it is, an immediate and direct answer to what is really intended by such objections; which is to show that the things objected against are incredible."—Bishop Butler.

"And having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself; by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven."—COL. i. 20.

IN this discourse I endeavour to show by analogy that Revelation and Nature unite in declaring, to the satisfaction of reason, the reasonableness and necessity of sacrifice as the law of life-giving, and of mediation as the law of life-continuance: and that both in Revelation and Nature, God's appointed means work identically to the same end.

The clause selected as the basis of the subject to which I purpose, with God's assistance, directing your minds and hearts to-day, is dependent upon these words of the preceding verse,—"It pleased the Father." Let us, then, read the text thus: "It pleased the Father, having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself; by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven."

Yes! the Almighty Father willed to reconcile all things unto Himself and to grant an eternal truce of peace to pardoned sinners, by virtue of the innocent blood of Christ shed upon the cross of shame for guilty man. As Jesus hung upon that cruel cross, with man beneath Him and God above Him, He showed Himself forth in real representation as the Mediator of man with God. In this attitude, we behold the dying, sacrificed One, the perfect type of Himself as the risen, living Daysman between earth and heaven. Wherefore, with adoring hearts, let us fall at His feet in truest sorrow and shame of soul for sin, in lowliest reverence for that justice which deemed reasonable the mediation of a Divine Advocate for human transgressors, and in enraptured love for that mercy which made necessary the sacrifice of the Lamb of God for the reconciliation of all things unto the Father. Oh!

Vol. XXV.—No. 646.

love of the Father so unselfish, so to love a guilty world as to give His willing, well-beloved Son, a peace-offering of everlasting reconciliation, and a death-offering unto life eternal.

The testimony of revelation is that God purposed to bring the elect world of mankind into eternal felicity by the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, by which divine appointment Christ was designated "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, slain for the life of the world." Under the figure of a slain lamb, dying innocence was to atone for living guilt.

Christ's divine sacrifice for sin, unlike the sacrificial shedding of the blood of a bull or a goat, for the sin of an individual, a family, or a nation, acceptable to God during a measured space of time only, was the atonement made for the guilt of the whole race of Adam, made once for all and free to all, available for all time and efficacious throughout all eternity.

Now I state, and trust to prove, that Nature, by the testimony of her operations, confirms the witness of Revelation, that sacrifice is necessary for life-giving, and mediation indispensable for life-sustaining; that "Death is the parent of life," and intervention the nurse sustaining life.

"Come," my brethren, "and let us reason together"; and since "in the mouth of two or three witnesses the thing is established," let us bring the witness of Revelation and Nature under the cross-examination of reason, and adjudicate the cause—the truth of the Atonement—according to the law and precedent of analogy. We shall best do so by examining unbiassedly the objections urged by various doubters of the Christian doctrine of atonement.

(a.) It is the plea of some objectors that it is impossible, or improbable, to believe that the death of one man could be the means of giving eternal life to all men believing in the efficacy of such means.

But, if reason allows it to be possible, nay, probable, that from the generation of one man all men have derived their temporal existence, so may it not be possible that from the regeneration of one Man filled immeasurably with the Spirit of God, as we claim Jesus was, all men may derive eternal life? So that, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. Our physical life, in its incipency, we derived arbitrarily; that is to say, we derived its *initia* without any *ertia* or active volition on our individual part: by analogy, therefore, is it not self-evident that regenerated spiritual life from God must, of necessity, receive its *initia* or beginning, in the way in which He has been pleased to bestow it? Now the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, upon the cross of Calvary, is the *initia*, the life-beginning—the way of the soul's eternal life. "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," said Christ, epitomising the great truth that His precious blood-shedding on the cross is the appointed way of life, and peace, and reconciliation of the world unto God. And belief—or

call it faith—is the participation of the individual soul in this Divine life-*initia*—the death of Christ—when, responsive to mutual sympathy, Christ and the soul develop the eternal spiritual life-growth.

Daily we perceive in the natural world sacrificial analogies to the Great Sacrifice for the salvation of mankind. For example, to produce the plant the seed must dissolve; to develop the fruit the blossom must fade: two of these acts are sacrificial, the other two are beneficial; the producing and the developing are beneficial, the dissolving and the fading are sacrificial; to secure the boon of the plant and the fruit, the sacrificial acts of the dissolving of the seed and the fading of the blossom are necessary. To give another illustration, the plant, dying, breathes its life into all its seed-progeny, and the seeds in turn must surrender their bodily investment—their “mortal coil”—before the life-germs can spring up in order to fulfil the law of life-continuance; for the body of the seed, the chrysalis as it were of the life-germ, must be surrendered in order that continuous existence may be preserved. The example, then, of the seed, does it not illustrate an inevitable principle of life-continuance which altereth not, and by analogy is equally applicable to all things, “whether, I say, they be things in earth or things in heaven”? Like argument can be adduced from the animal as well as from the vegetable kingdom, proving that sacrifice is the necessary appointed means for continuing and maintaining life. And if we study the moral executive of the world within us, we shall discover a like application of the same law: for who will deny, taking our faculties and affections as a whole, that the sacrifice of the evil ones brings benefit to the being who sacrifices them? And further we shall see, that in our personal relations to the world without, if we would *save* ourselves from want and pain, and gain the *benefits* of plenty and peace, the sacrifice of present ease and the denial of immediate pleasure must be undertaken. Judging by the law and precedent of analogy, does not reason deem valid the united testimony of divine revelation and natural operation, that sacrificial death is the appointed means for beneficial lifegiving?

That Jesus was the appointed Man, that Divine Seed of the woman, whose sacrificed body was decreed to give everlasting life to all the seed of Adam, is the burden of Revelation; and Nature, in sympathetic agony with the sacrifice of her God, by the eclipsed sun, by the Temple's riven veil, by the quaking earth, rent rocks, and chasming graves, affirmed the cry that resounded from the judgment seat of Pontius Pilate—“Behold the Man!” “Behold the Man!” exclaimed the heathen judge; and the fierce responsive clamours reverberating through the judgment-hall—“Away with Him! away with Him! Crucify Him!”—were the very antiphone, the very fulfilment of that Divine prophecy which pre-announced Him to be the Man: whilst the terrorised

Roman governor's fiat of craven compliance with the will of the raging multitude, was the mandate of heaven for the manumission of a world from the bondage of sin and death.

(b.) A further objection is advanced, that it is contrary to reason to suppose that by any law of necessity an act of wanton, murderous cruelty perpetrated upon the body of one Man, Christ Jésus, by the Jews of one generation, should be God's appointed means for granting exemption from eternal death to every soul of man believing in the efficacy of those means.

But natural experience thrusts upon our attention frequent instances of acts of apparent cruelty being necessary to the accomplishment of acts of great mercy. Take the instance of a finger whose morbid condition is such that its sacrifice becomes necessary to save the whole body. The sacrifice of the finger seems cruel, but the mercy to the whole body, flowing from the sacrifice, proves it reasonable and necessary. Now the morbidity of the sin of mankind was laid upon the sin-bearer, Christ; for “the Lord hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us all”; the virus of human guilt was, so to speak, vicariously localised in Him, in order that the chastisement of our peace might be upon Him: “and He was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was He stricken.” In this manner the Saviour's imputed guilt worked the sinner's imputed righteousness; and the permission of the commission of an act of cruelty by the Jews of one generation, was the necessary instrument employed by the Almighty to save humanity by an operation, the severity of which towards one Man, was justified by its infinite mercy to the rest of mankind. God's will and man's will—Divine love and human hatred—formed the cross whereon the Volunteer Redeemer reconciled the world unto God. The Godhead surrendering the Manhood was the upright beam, and humanity compassing His death to save humanity formed the cross-beam; and thus was the cross of Christ created by the crossing and countersecting of two wills, the Divine Saviour's sacrificial one, and the ruined sinner's necessary one—the need of salvation. And now, let me dismiss any still wilful unbeliever of this type, with the words of another, an ancient unbeliever, the high priest Caiaphas: “Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one Man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.”

(c.) Another cavil of objectors to the Christian doctrine of atonement is, that some men, in spite of the efficacy of the Sacrifice, are not to participate in the advantages it is believed to confer; and if God be all-good and all-powerful to save, why is not the sacrifice of Christ the effectual means of salvation to all mankind?

Let us once more appeal to the precedent which the natural world affords, and we shall see that all

the seeds propagated by the originating seed do not fructify; in fact, some remain practically dead, although enjoying like conditions with their fellow-seeds, although sown, planted, and tended by the same nurturing hand. Just so is it with men. It is true the *initia* of spiritual life by the death of Christ is given incipiently to all men; but, although enjoying like conditions with their fellows, although they be as seed sown, and planted, and hedged in, by the same Lord of the vineyard, and tended by the same faithful Husbandman, in some men the spiritual life-principle abides motionless in the body of sin—abides non-vitative—till the harvest-tide of grace is past, and the tie binding body and soul is sundered, and the unfructifying seed perishes in the desolation of the Second Death. Unto such are the words of Revelation applicable: "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and *they* are not saved."

(d.) A more thoroughsped class of objectors, while allowing that through the sacrificial life and death of Christ good came to the world, in the same way as good may come from the death of any martyr who suffers for any great moral principle, yet deny, as contrary to reason, the abstract necessity for any intervention on the part of Christ as a Mediator of reconciliation between God and man.

Now this denial of theirs challenges the necessity of mediation. Let us again turn our attention to the natural world for evidence as to the part played by mediation in the maintenance of God's appointments therein; and, if it be shown that mediation is His method for the maintenance of natural things, it cannot with reason be objected that mediation may not be His mode for the sustainment of spiritual things. I fear not to assert that the whole universe "of things in earth or things in heaven" is governed and held together by one vast system of mediation or intervention. Take what you will—the sun is a mediator—the atmosphere is a mediator—the serous fluid in the blood is a mediator. Were the orb of day, the sun, to drop from its position in space, the position of every planet in our solar system would be materially altered. We do not know what would be the ultimate effect of such a phenomenon, but we do know the immediate effect; namely, that the present physical condition of our planet, and also that of every other planet in our solar system, would undergo a change prejudicial to their present conditions of life. Consequently, it is by the mediation of our sun that each of the planets in our solar system is saved from injurious displacement. It is by the mediation or intervention of our atmosphere that the sun's rays are so modified as to give all earthly existence the necessary quantity of heat and light for health and sustenance. In our own bodies, were it not for the mediation of the serous fluid in the blood, the first skin-deep scratch we received would be the cause of our bleeding to death. Since, then, the law of mediation obtains

throughout the whole material universe, does that law halt at the threshold of the spiritual world? Does that law of peace become null and void at the cross of mount Calvary? or does it not continue, by the law of continuance, in all things, "whether, I say, they be things in earth or things in heaven?" The mediation of Him by Whom all things were created ought, surely, to be sufficient to reconcile all things unto Himself; and if that Divinely appointed law of mediation abide, as most surely it does, then we may have peace with God through the blood of the cross, and reconciliation with the Father through the mediation of the Crucified One.

(e.) Still the further objection might be advanced, that the plan of mediation by Christ is an exceptional one, when compared with the general law which the mediatorial system in nature obeys.

I answer, let it be so granted: but man's position in nature is also an exceptional one. The revolving orb of day, the mantling atmosphere of earth, and the restoring fluid of the blood, have no volition of their own; they render an altogether mechanical obedience to the law of the mediatorial system in nature. But man, on the contrary, is a free-willed creature, the physical and the moral parts of whose dual nature, incited by temptation of sin, war continually the one with the other, although they were originally designed to form one harmonious whole. As regards man's physical nature, its action is partly mechanical; but with respect to his moral nature, he is wholly responsible. Therefore, on the ground of his speciality—his moral responsibility—his position in the universe is exceptional, and an exceptional plan of mediation became a necessity to meet his case. This exceptional plan of mediation the Son of God undertook to accomplish, by taking unto Himself the nature of a man in the humanity of Jesus. Thus Christ being God and Man, was by such unity of Person an exceptional man: He came and dwelt among sinners, yet, in His physical nature being without stain of sin, He could mediate for sinful flesh by virtue of this exceptional perfection. In His moral responsible nature He was equally exceptionally perfect, hence He could pour out His soul unto death, even the death of the Cross, and mediatorially offer His merits on behalf of all sinful souls. And as I have shown concerning Sacrifice, in like manner it can be proved concerning Mediation, that whether we examine the world without, or the world within, or study their interdependent relations the one to the other, the great law of Mediation holds sway in all things, "whether, I say, they be things in earth or things in heaven."

Fully assured of the conclusiveness of this analogical evidence, we may answer objectors to the Christian doctrine of Atonement—or rather let their so-called god, Nature, give them the answer—that it is possible to believe, arguing from the

analogous precedents of sacrifice and mediation in nature, that the death of one specially appointed Man as a sacrifice for sin can give life to mankind "dead in trespasses and sin," and that His Médiation is necessary for the sustainment and continuation of that life. The more keenly the appointments of God in Revelation and in Nature are examined, the more closely will their twin-likeness become apparent; and the more evident becomes God's characteristic identity of working in His natural and spiritual universes—One God, one working. The Bible, the rubric of God, and Science, the rubric of Nature, are not analogous in the sense of running parallel, but they are so in the sense of running convergent; and Science shall one day meet Revelation in the same centre of unity—absolute truth.

But, my Christian brethren, however convincing to the mind, however consoling to the heart, the evidence adduced from nature may be, in support of the reasonableness of the hope that is in us, that the Crucified Christ is the Life-giver, and the Glorified Christ the Life-sustainer; it is assurance enough for us to have God's assurance in Revelation, that Christ the Lamb of God was the bleeding sacrifice for us sinners, and is the all-powerful Mediator between us and God the Father:—the ensign of His mediatorial power, adorned with God Incarnate, a culprit's cross—the crown of His sacrificial glory, gemmed with the lifedrops of His precious blood, a wreath of thorns—and the triumph-cry of the dying Victor over the Prince of darkness, and the legions of hell—the cry of the dying Saviour, "It is finished"! Promised overthrow of powers and principalities, promised grants of thrones and heavenly kingdoms, promised gifts of endless life and bliss; by what means were these high promises to be redeemed?—for these high promises had that Man of Sorrows made to His faithful followers—by what means were they to be redeemed? Heaven and earth reply: By that culprit's cross, by that crown of thorns, and by that expiring triumph-cry: "It is finished! It is finished!" These were the chosen insignia of His mediatorial power, glory, and triumph: these are the insignia to us of pardon, peace, and everlasting life.

Oh, Divine pre-eminence of Sacrifice and Médiation! 'Twas Thine, Blessed Jesus, as we this day are assembled most adoringly, most gratefully to commemorate,—'twas Thine to make our peace with God through the blood of Thy Cross; 'twas Thine on that Cross to hang bleeding, bruised, forsaken; in agony for our sins, in shame for our iniquities, a suffering, dying substitute for guilty humanity. Ah, my Christian brethren, every holy hope of the human heart, every dear desire of the longing soul of man for life and peace, eternal spiritual life and peace celestial, must be laid upon the altar of that Divine Sacrifice voluntarily offered up on the Mount of Calvary, to be purified and subli-

mated in the furnace of Christ's affliction, of the dross of earthly corruption, ere they be acceptable offerings to the reconciled Father in Heaven.

I beseech you to contemplate the incalculable price paid for man's salvation, the descent of Deity for the exaltation of fallen, helpless humanity! Contemplate the magnitude of the sacrifice! Behold the majesty of the Victim! Conceive—impossible to conceive—the glory He abandoned; and think of the robe of shame, the garment of our humanity, the Prince of life and glory put on! And think, oh think! that

Having given the rest before,

Abandoned all the splendour of His heavenly glory

Having given the rest before,

Here He gave up His life to pay our score.*

And when we most feel how Jesus Christ, the Divine Son, "did humble Himself even to the death upon the cross for us, miserable sinners, who lay in darkness and the shadow of death," let us demand of our consciences, let us inquire of our hearts, What have we done for Jesus? What can we do for His sake? And the answer shall come in His own blessed words: Deny thyself, take up My cross and follow Me. For he that taketh not his cross and followeth after Me, is not worthy of Me. How are we to follow Him? Leaning upon the staff of His Divinity, let us follow in the footprints of His humanity—footprints of love, mercy, and self-sacrifice,—footprints that shall lead every one of Christ's cross-bearers safely and surely to the home of the Father.

Now, "the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness, but unto us, which are saved, it is the power of God."

CHRISTIANITY WITHOUT CHRIST.

BY THE REV. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A.,
CHAPLAIN AT GOTHENBURG.

SERMON PREACHED AT GOTHENBURG, ON SUNDAY 11TH MARCH, 1888.

"No man rendeth a piece from a new garment and putteth it upon an old garment; else he will rend the new, and also the piece from the new will not agree with the old. And no man putteth new wine into old wineskins; else the new wine will burst the skins, and itself will be spilt, and the skins will perish."—ST. LUKE v. 36, 37. (Revised Version.)

BEFORE opening our main subject let us just note in passing the illustration we have here of the manysidedness and readiness of the Master's mind. Upon a festive gathering a religious squabble is obtrusively thrust; there are those who on the ground of religion objected to the social and convivial habits of Christ and His disciples. These objections our Lord answers

* George Herbert.

gently and considerately, and then, as was His wont, lets the subject thus started be an occasion for the showing forth of some of the principles of the Gospel He taught. But the point which strikes our mere admiration most vividly is the readiness with which He takes up the incidents of a feast, such as He was then present at, to illustrate the deep spiritual truth He would lay open. The garments suitable for such an occasion; the wine which furnished the main part of the feast, these He can immediately adapt to His thought. And further, after so exquisitely beautiful a use of such every-day matters to declare the spirit of His message, then, by a turn in the metaphor which only enhances its beauty, with that gentleness and consideration for wounded feelings which is always so marked in Him, He soothes the perplexed disciples of John by showing how natural it was that they should not be ready to appreciate immediately the full meaning of the principle He has just enunciated. By the parables of our text He shows them how hopeless it was to think of combining the law and the Gospel; how the note of His word was *freedom*; and then, to shield them from any exultation on the part of His own followers, He remarks on the natural inclination of men at all times and with all subjects—but more especially with religious subjects and in eastern minds—to prefer the old to the new. So He adds, “No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith, The old is better.”

But now to our subject. What are the old and new garments? What is the new wine? What is the point in the parable where we are to look for the Lord’s word to us? The subject here brought before us is the complement of what we considered together last Sunday. There we saw how men will surrender to God’s call *everything except the one thing* He asks for; to-day we shall see how our Lord declares that to take a part of the full message of God to us, and try and mend up our lives with that, only ends in failure; and again, how even to take the Gospel of grace and use it wrongly is not only futile, but absolutely fatal. Friends, you are solemnly and most tenderly warned here against that last resource of an awakened conscience, the receiving of half or a part of the Gospel and not the whole. Here is seen the inconsistency of a patched-up religion; here is the madness of attempting to secure the life of the free spirit of the Gospel of Grace within an un-renewed and unregenerated heart. Have the real Gospel or nothing.

But see this truth in all its bearings and in its immediate connexion.

I. First see how this applied to the special case here. The Law of Moses was good, excellent, but you could never spin from it a wedding garment fit for the marriage feast of the Bridegroom who is now come to claim His own. The baptism of John was good, his preaching of repentance true,

his austere life and severe rules suitable and fitting, but they had not the power or the spirit of the Gospel of Christ Jesus. And some of the disciples of John followed our Lord from time to time, to learn of Him also; but they were not prepared to accept Him in the place of their own master. What they were prepared to do, however, was to take parts of the Gospel as they heard it—let us imagine, for example, the exposition of the Law as given in the Sermon on the Mount—and with these beautify and repair the somewhat imperfect system of the old dispensation.

Now as to this Christ declares that His Gospel stands as a whole. Cut it up, and its glory is gone. In a very real way the robe which Christ had at the scene of His crucifixion, typifies His whole Person and work; it “was without seam, woven from the top throughout.”

The attempt was made—aye, and is constantly made—to do this very thing against which Christ here so emphatically protests. Indeed, the Gospel among the Jews was absolutely torn to shreds and abandoned as useless, through the persistent attempts of a section of the Church to patch up the Mosaic ritual and law with pieces cut from the Christian faith. The Epistle to the Galatians reveals clearly enough the miserable result of this attempt. In all truth the old garment of the Law looked very shabby and very dilapidated when decked out with a few odd pieces of the “righteousness which is by faith in Jesus Christ.” Had not St. Paul firmly insisted on the new wine he gave them being put into fit bottles, the Church had perished speedily.

II. But let us come nearer home. “*Is it possible to take the beauty and the glory of the Christian faith without the Christian Gospel?*” That is the question of all questions in modern society. It is folly to shut our eyes to the fact that the attempt to do this is being made on an enormous scale. It means this: Let us take as the basis of religion human nature as it is—respectable, educated, refined human nature—for this newest of Gospels has no word for any but these; the poor, the sad, the depraved it passes wholly by: it knows it has no power to succour them. Then taking the best parts of the words of Jesus—acknowledging His life as absolutely ideal—taking the Christian graces, charity, truth, humility, and so on; cutting these forcibly out of the perfect Christian system, it uses their purity and whiteness to trim up the old worn-out garment of this somewhat discredited humanity, and so would clothe our nakedness. Perhaps it would be presumptuous in me to criticise this attempt. I may be content to remark that precisely the same thing was tried in the case of the Neo-Platonists of Alexandria, and though productive of much true thinking and many isolated, noble lives, it yet passed away. The wine they sought to store in their old bottles was too strong, the patched garment only became hopelessly ragged.

It seems, indeed, that the spirit and the body of the Christian faith must ever be joined to make the living power. Take the spirit from the body and you have killed both. *Christianity without Christ* you may not have.

Christianity without Christ. There then we have it in a form which brings the matter down from the historical Baptists and Pharisees and the abstract speculations of European thought, to us individual men and women met this day in a Christian church.

Friends, is not that just what some of you really are desiring? Let us have the Gospel, but no Saviour! Let us have the salvation, but no Cross! Let us have Jesus the Teacher and Thinker, but not Christ the Master and King.

In this way. Christ lays down (as I tried to show recently), as the fundamental position, the very basis of His religious teaching, the doctrine of conversion. "Ye must be born again." "Except ye be converted." "Except ye repent." His teaching begins at the root of the life. He is no mender of old systems, but the Giver of a new life. Therefore in all His dealings with men He brings them back to face this question: How far is your life renewed, re-created? For instance, the young man of excellent moral life who came to Christ asking, "What lack I yet?" and who was, said Jesus, "not far from the kingdom of Heaven;" to him is put the question, Are you prepared to sacrifice the whole world, sell all, and follow Me? This is not, as might seem, a piece from Christ's new garment, offered to strengthen and garnish the old he had so carefully preserved. Far from it. It is Christ just showing him the exceeding purity and whiteness of the robe of the Christian disciple, that he may compare it with his best pretension, and see the nakedness of his heart. "Not far" he was, but still outside the kingdom. Nothing less than a complete change of heart could suffice to make that step possible, which would have removed him from the world he loved not utterly yet loved too dearly, to the kingdom he sought not carelessly, yet sought too selfishly. No! the very thing he thought to get from Christ was what Christ would not and could not give him. He looked for some little finishing touch to render his system of law-keeping perfect. But from the hands of the Christian Saviour you must needs take the whole garment or none. If you will have His new wine, you must have new bottles also.

In detail we may say that this twofold parable gives us two aspects of the relation of the new Gospel to old and needy lives. The one referring to the outward garb of true religion—the other to its inward power. The one to doctrine, say, the other to grace; the one to belief, the other to faith; the one to justification, the other to sanctification.

1. In another place, Christ uses this same image of the fitting garment for the marriage supper; with-

out which no guest could be admitted. God does not desire any shabby religiousness to take the place of the white robe of salvation. Mark well what Christ here exposes to the gaze of all beholders. It is any attempt to make anything short of God's standard take the place of the everlasting Gospel, even if parts and fragments of the Gospel are received and welcomed to make up for deficiencies. The Jew cannot become Christian by admiring Christ's interpretation of Moses. The disciple of John does not find the power of Christianity to lie in any new rules of conduct, or in any new interpretation of old truths. Nor can the mediocre and mechanical religion of modern society be transformed into something worthy, by trimming it with a few Christian doctrines, or by taking unto itself a selection of the Christian graces. To be of the world worldly in early life: to turn away from the Kingdom of God, in favour of the "great possessions" of earth, to take one's fill of the good things of this life; and then, when middle age comes on, and it is no longer seemly, or prudent, or respectable to follow this path; when the old garment has become travel-stained, and there are certain ugly rents in it which one would wish to conceal, then comes the time when a covetous eye is cast on that robe of righteousness which is to be seen in the hands of Christ. Or it may be that the soul protests earlier, the conscience stirs, the voice of God is heard demanding of us a reason for our miserable appearance. What then shall we do? Shall we come humbly and crave from Christ the robe which we see He has, and which we believe would cover us and our rags, and which we know is to be had at the asking? No! that would be to confess our utter need. "Rather," we say, "let us secure a few pieces from it and therewith mend and repair our faulty characters." Thus is it that you see that very contemptible spectacle—the religious worldling: a man decked in a strange mixture, an incongruous, inconsistent mixture of old clothes and new; the old worldliness which he heartily loves, and the new practices for which he does not care, and which fit in ill with the bent of his mind, making its rents worse and its faults more apparent. In the main he is the man he always was; but a little religiousness is put on here and there—and a motley patch is the result: neither a downright honest servant of mammon, nor a straightforward honest disciple of Christ the Lord. Well may Isaiah say that all our righteousness is as "filthy rags," if that is the best we can produce!

But see what Christ offers instead, "A robe woven from the top throughout." Let us drop as far as possible all metaphor, and get down to the real thing. And may the Holy Spirit of God grant grace to speak and grace to hear, that we may see the salvation of God.

Friends, Christ your Saviour only points out

your need, and the mockery of your efforts to save yourselves, in order that He may supply that which you lack. I don't know very much about the precise theological weight and bearing of the doctrine of "imputed righteousness." But this I do know, and in God's name declare unto you; that in Christ Jesus you do get that which your very longing shows plainly you have not got and yet would gladly have—a righteousness which can cover all the shame of your naked life; a righteousness perfect, unsullied, secure; a righteousness as infinitely above the paltry "religiousness" of men, as the heaven is above the earth; a righteousness which is better than yourself at your best; a righteousness which will bear the gaze of the Holy One and the Just; a righteousness which makes God a desirable and a loveable and a joyful thought to you. And that I do know, that and no less, is what may be had at the hands of Christ here, now—this very moment. Will you take it?

In very truth, friends, I do not desire to indulge in rhetoric. I speak in sober earnest. It is not a theological juggling of words; it is not a mistaking of feelings for realities. I speak of what is removed far above all the changing feelings of the heart. It is a fact capable of knowledge that you can so *identify yourself* (for there is the whole matter compressed into one idea)—you can so *identify* yourself with Christ the Lord, as to know that you are His and He is yours; that you are one with Him and He with you; that that magnificent holiness of His, that exquisite glory of righteousness, He shares with you as He would have shared His bread or His cloak with any needy starveling.

How does your patchwork, self-contained kind of substitute for true religion look beside that? O friends and Christian brothers, don't mar the glory of the Christ—the great, noble Son of Man, the compassionate, loving Son of God—by putting your attempt at a decent make-up of the odds and ends of a life, in comparison with that unsullied grandeur. Don't exhibit your poverty of soul and rob Him of the glory of your perfect salvation, by trusting to your attempt at righteousness—to be eked out by scraps of His Gospel. That makes the old garment worse, and defrauds the new.

Pay no heed to those wordy subtleties which have never done anything but disguise the truth, hiding folly with words; but consider if it is right or seemingly, or above all possible, to have this Christianity without this Christ.

Christ identified Christianity—the Christian hope, the Christian ideal of man, the Christian virtue, the Christian sweetness and beautifulness of life: all these Christ identified with Himself. And Christ also identified Himself with all those who would take Him as their Saviour. There is God's fair offer of salvation, *salvation with Christ; Christ with salvation*. Be content with God's providing of the fitting garment, and then you will know how infinitely the "righteousness which is by

faith in Jesus Christ," surpasses the "righteousness which is by Law"—even if that Law is the Law of Christ's own Gospel. The whole Christ and the whole Christianity. That is what the Master pleads for.

2. As to the second figure. It means, I think, this (the same truth in another aspect). If you take Christ's righteousness, take it with a whole heart. This spirit of the Gospel it is impossible to contain in the worn out formulæ of the old life. The foundation of Christianity is *Christ*, the Person of Christ living, working, dying, being. *He is Christianity*. But again, the aim and purpose of Christ is—*Christianity*. The one is impossible for us without personal living contact with Him; and again, the personal living faith in Christ the Saviour must needs produce in us the other, viz., the spirit of Christian living. Says St. Paul, looking as was his wont, more especially at the first of these truths, the truth of the new garment, "the just shall live by faith." Says St. James, looking, for his part more specially at the second truth here revealed, the truth of the new wine in new bottles, "Can faith save? As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

Practically speaking this second figure teaches us that the Christian life cannot be lived in an unregenerate heart. *Christianity is not natural. Godliness is absolutely different from earthliness*. "The natural man," says St. Paul, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit . . . neither indeed can know them, for they are spiritually discerned." Christ does not offer a half salvation any more than He will give a half Gospel. He claims the whole life; He claims the very heart and soul of you.

Here, perhaps, we shall part company some of us. The difficulty with some is that they would take the offer of mercy, they would take the hope of redemption, they would take Christ's work for them, but will not accept His work in them. Friends, if you would have this new wine to store up against your day of need you must truly have new wineskins to keep it in. If you will have Christ and His salvation at the last, in the time of distress, in the hour of death, in the day of Judgment, you must have Christ's salvation now while it can renew the life and purify the spirit.

This, then, is Christ's reply to those who seek to patch up an old life with a mutilated Gospel.

Take Christianity *with Christ* if you would know its beauty; take Christ *with the Christianity* of Christ, if you would know the fulness of salvation. Take the Saviour with the Prophet: the Master with the Gospel. He is the King as well as the Redeemer, the Lord as well as the Life.

MR. A. O. SMITH, of Birmingham, son of an Ex-President of the Wesleyan Conference, has sent in his resignation as a minister, and has gone to Durham University with the intention of taking holy orders.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
 and all **Pulmonary**
Affections can be
 immediately re-
 lieved and rapidly
CURED
 by simply
 using
 the

AMMONIAPHONE

FOR
 THE
Voice,
Throat,
Chest,
and Lungs.

21s. post free.
 WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by
 the Royal Family, and principal
 Physicians, Clergymen,
 Vocalists, and Public Speakers
 throughout the country. New illus-
 trated Pamphlet with copies of Thou-
 sands of **FREE OF CHARGE**
 Testimonials
 may be had
 on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
 Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 12, 1888.

THE POPE'S CENSURE.

THIS opens many important considerations, and may be read with profit in the light of the past and present. It is evident that this affair involves the fundamental question, whether Irish Roman Catholicism is to be *a religion with or without morality and humanity*. How in the past it was of the latter sort, appears in Camden's *Hibernicorum Mores*. He tells that plundering raids were universal, and though horribly savage, were held in no infamy: that those about to go out on preying expeditions, used to pray God for booty and seize it as His good gift, persuaded that their violence, rapine and homicide, were not displeasing to Him. Cut-throats and incendiaries openly said that "God was too tender-hearted to visit on them the price of their victim's blood." They claimed the pattern of their fore-fathers' lives, and accepted it as their own; nay, held it a disgrace to their nobler blood, if they turned from a life of violence and crime to one of honest industry. Night raids with desperate long journeys on foot, deeds of violent spoliation, they preferred to decent quiet resting on their beds. They came to spare neither temples nor sacred places, they burned as well as plundered them, and even on such occasions the minor clergy were not disgraced by engaging in such scandalous works, nay, even in murder. The sons of their clergy neglected learning, and became heroes in raiding. They were, many of them, named MacDecan, MacPherson, MacO'Spac, that is, sons of the deacon, the parson, the bishop, and used their father's influence and immunities to gather bands of seditious followers, and thus became distinguished and

powerful in evil exploits. So before the Reformation.

The principles of combined resistance by subjects to their sovereigns, of recovering alienated property like Antivari, of keeping no faith with heretics and so forth, under direction of the Church, and the modes of carrying all this out, are expressed in many Bulls and exemplified in various instances. The Report of the Irish Commissioners of Education, 1825, etc., exhibits the devices by which Dr. Doyle desperately sought to neutralise the effect of the authorities and instances recited. The works of Liguori and Dens give most explicitly false and immoral solutions of moral doubts raised on the subjects of contracts, combinations and difficulties about "Thou shalt not steal." The celebrated speech of Mr. Parnell at Ennis, in which he exhorted his hearers and the whole body of the Irish Celts, "as a more Christian and charitable way than shooting," to shun what were called "Land grabbers," was nothing else than a popular application of the major excommunication of the Church of Rome. The mnemonic line runs thus:

"*Os, orare, vale, communicio, mensa, negatur.*"

And Mr. Parnell said, "You must show him on the roadside, you must show him in the streets of the town, you must show him in the shop, in the fair green and market-place, and even in the place of worship—by leaving him alone, by putting him into a moral Coventry, by isolating him from the rest of his country as if he was a leper of old,—you must show him your detestation of the crime he has committed." The Irish Roman Catholics were thus to be made active instruments in carrying out "the *Shun and Show*" him methods in the interests of "the Church," but they now tried these methods on their own account, and clergy and laity joined, nay, some of their bishops wrote formal approvals. Besides the higher teachings of Bulls and Doctors, they had catechisms instructing them much to the same purpose, put into circulation *cum permissio*; also there had been a translation of the New Testament with congenial notes. Again, they saw how Dr. Moran was rejected because moderate, and Dr. Walsh accepted because a violent Nationalist, for Archbishop of Dublin; and all read the recent threats and insults of Dr. Nulty of Meath, so weighty in thus turning the scales. Their Land League Associations were projected on ecclesiastical, that is, on parochial lines, and presided over by nearly 2,000 secular ecclesiastics. The pontifical censures of Mr. Parnell were made in vain, and an English ex-Prime Minister minimised their great combination, as a legitimate phase of Trade Union Combinations. At length, though not without facts betokening further action, such as the Persico Mission, the thunder-cloud gathers, and pontifical lightning flashes from the skies. And this after (as one said) the Irish had been left in the dark, to say

the least of it, for over two years and more of inaction, from which they concluded (if not in fallible ignorance, even apathy at least) the full approval of their objects and methods to be entertained at Rome. Up to this time, like their forefathers of whom Camden wrote, they were willing to support and profess a religion, consistent with and adapted to their peculiar notions of morality and humanity. Also they did not conform to a religion which, under great difficulties, taught in their streets and valleys and hilltops, a pure faith and generous morality. Further, everything was done to make them love the former and their "soggarth aroon"; and to hate and dread the latter, as the type and doom of Saxon Conquest. Nay, in furtherance of the policy of their Church, they knew how their ancestors had been goaded by Roman emissaries, armed Bishops and ample indulgences, into rebellion after rebellion against England, in the interests of this or that Roman project. And when project after project failed, their estates were forfeited and the oldest families cast out upon the world. And themselves they found up to their financial ability, nay, beyond it by far, crushed and cajoled out of enormous annual and bulk sums under various pretexts of Church advancement. What will they think now, how feel, with whom take counsel, whither turn their hearts, where repair the damage to their shattered hopes, and wherewithal betake themselves for financial aid and friendly guidance? Above all, how will they act towards those who, as they feel, have used them for their purposes, and betrayed them at their convenience? If the policy of Rome towards England in the days of the Reformation, strengthened this Reformation immensely, can it be that the like is now imminent for Ireland, or else a reign of infidelity as in France, with American Socialism rife—with the Pope boycotted, with the Plan of Campaign directed against the Church, and with all priests and bishops who are adverse to a Roman Catholic Irish religion *without morality and humanity* proscribed and starved out, as the obnoxious "land-grabbers" and "the exacting landlords" have been and are. Yet all this may be the stormy dawn of a better day. There may be many Irishmen who, disgusted with the whole affair and with the managers and masters of such a system, will come to a better mind, and seek and find a *religion with morality and humanity* near at hand, and worthy and Irish all throughout moreover, though they have been taught to despise and reject this so long and so blindly. *De profundis ad te clamavi* may become the general cry of the Irish Celts, for "with God nothing is impossible." Anyhow, there is a wide split and compound fracture between the Pope and the people. How to get on in future without the popular favour and the mob of "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort" at their back and under

their beck will exhibit features of Irish priest life new and startling in the extreme, together with a facility of "sitting on two stools" (morality and immorality), requiring india-rubber agility in priests and prelates. And how far the *quid pro quo* of denominational education, if offered, may set up an acetous fermentation into high activity, and add another furious element to the seething imbroglio is all in the future, unless, indeed, the Irish race are become, as Bishop O'Molony wrote of them, "cow-hearted."

PHILIP DWYER, A.M.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS AS OBSERVED IN ENGLAND.

FIRST commandment. There is a large minority of persons in England who deny that there is a God. The majority of the remaining majority pay God no respect.

2nd. This commandment is not literally disobeyed to any great extent. Men do not worship images of the things which God created. But they violate the spirit of this commandment when they worship Money, as great numbers do; or Humanity (whatever that may be), as the Comtists do; or the physical world of Nature, as the Atheists very nearly do.

3rd. Cursing and swearing are more common, and that in more disgusting terms, in England than in any other country.

4th. This commandment is obeyed less and less every year as the years go by.

5th. This commandment is disregarded much more in England than in many other countries.

6th. When this commandment is violated, as it frequently is, much sympathy is exhibited towards the violator, many persons taking trouble to effect that he shall not be properly punished. This is a sure manifestation that they have little respect for the commandment, for they represent that the practical enforcement of it is a violation of it.

7th. The regard in which this commandment is held is evidenced by the establishment in England, during recent times, of a court of law, the administration of which has the effect of making adultery comparatively respectable in the world's eyes.

8th. Some forms of breach of this commandment are severely dealt with in England; as the stealing of a turnip out of a field. Other forms of it, which the letter of the law is so clumsily framed, with or without design it is hard to tell, as not to reach swindling of the larger kind for instance, are held in a kind of honour.

9th. The breach of this commandment is for the most part lightly thought of, and is almost always condoned when the offender makes what is called an apology, or pays money.

10th. There is hardly any attempt at the obser-

vance of this commandment. One of the worst and most ruinous practical breaches of it, both to men's fortunes and their souls, that is gambling, is on the increase in England. Covetous motives largely enter into men's judgments in affairs of public politics. There is a whole sect of politicians who aim at getting public confidence, and power, and office, by suggesting to sundry classes of people methods whereby they may be able to convert their neighbour's property to their own use through legal enactments.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

SIR,—In his appreciative notice, in the last number of the PULPIT, of a fresh edition of Dr. Salmon's well-known "Introduction to the New Testament," your reviewer says, "Dr. Salmon disposes in a masterly way of the attempts which have been made to assign the Acts to a writer in the second century. Admissions of adverse critics show that large portions of the book must have been written by a companion of St. Paul, and it is impossible to sever these portions from the rest; and among all the known companions of St. Paul, no one fits the conditions of the problem better than he to whom the earliest and best traditions assign the book, namely, St. Luke." Permit me to point out that "the first testimony in favour of St. Luke's authorship of the Acts is a *full century later* than the presumptive date of its composition; its mere existence cannot be proved till the year 170 A.D." (Zeller). A century-old tradition is not necessarily reliable, much less conclusive. Moreover, "it is clear from St. Paul's allusions that St. Luke was a Gentile convert, and that he had not been circumcised." "Tradition has always declared that he was a Gentile" (Farrar). See Col. iv. 11, 14, which is quite conclusive on this point. The author of the Acts was most unquestionably a Jew, imbibing from his earliest childhood Hebraistic modes of thought, and the peculiar Hellenistic expressions of the Septuagint version of his own sacred books. The Jew is no more a manufactured article than the poet. Of both the saying is equally true, *Nascitur, non fit*. Every page, if not every line of his great work, describing the rise and progress of the kingdom of God amongst the benighted and degraded Gentile world, gives abundant evidence of the Jewish origin of the author. Having microscopically examined and carefully analysed the phraseology, I could easily fill several columns with detailed proofs; but, for the moment at least, I refrain. I venture, with all due respect, but with all the confidence that a thorough examination of the facts alone can give, to challenge Dr. Salmon's conclusion, echoed by your reviewer; and to give a point-blank contradiction, in the most emphatic terms which courtesy permits, to the statement that St. Luke was the author of the Acts. He was not, because he could not have been the author. The *Gentile* Luke could no more have composed the *Hebraistic*

Acts of the Apostles, than Victor Hugo could have written "In Memoriam." It is utterly impossible, and it is high time that this simple and obvious fact were thoroughly recognised.

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 5th, 1888.

JACOB'S FRAUD.

SIR,—In the short letter in which Mr. Murphy comments on my remarks on the above-named subject, he seems to me to have written in haste, and without his usual thoughtfulness and insight. His first statement is to the effect that the really important question is whether the story is true; his second, that what I have said about the progressive character of revelation is dangerously near to saying that God is not the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. I am compelled to traverse both these statements for reasons which I will give, taking for convenience the latter first.

1. Revelation has always come to mankind at large through men, and has always borne on itself, more or less, the impress of the minds through which it has passed. The truth of God has not been like a light shining down clear and unmixed from heaven, but like a leaven infused into chosen souls, and mingling with their various qualities and idiosyncrasies. Hence the result in their utterances has been a mixed one, partly divine, partly human, and the more imperfect their knowledge, the more limited their moral and spiritual faculty, the less did those utterances correspond to the full and consummate truth. In accordance with this view I said that the character of God was very imperfectly conceived and represented by the earlier organs of revelation, *i.e.*, the earlier Biblical writers and teachers, and came out more and more clearly by degrees, as men rose to higher conceptions of morality and goodness, till it reached its glorious climax in the Incarnate Son, who is Himself the perfect image and representation to us of the Eternal Father. How Mr. Murphy can bring himself to say that this view in any degree approximates to an assertion that God Himself changes, I am unable to imagine. I took care distinctly to say that "in Himself God is always the same"; and that what I meant was the growing truth and clearness of the portraiture of Him given in the successive parts of the Bible. Surely the gradual improvement of the portrait through the increased skill of the artist does not imply any change in the object portrayed! When the faint and blurred reflection in the mirror that is tarnished and foul, passes into a clear image as the mirror grows clean and bright, we never think of saying that it is the object, not the mirror, that is changed. When through the mists of the dawn the sun looks dim or red, and as the sky grows clear shines out at last in its glory, "nor dim, nor red, like God's own Head," we never imagine that it is the sun itself which has changed. Why, then, in the name of reason, should it be suggested that a change in the Eternal God Himself is implied in the doctrine that the Biblical representation of Him gradually advanced in clearness and truth?

2. As little reason do I find for the other statement, that the really important question is, Whether the story is true. There are three estimates of it which are open to the critic. He may take it as a strictly

historical narrative; or as a legendary version of some real occurrence; or as a pure fiction based upon, or intended to account for, certain observed facts in the relations of the Israelites. But in regard to the moral difficulty which I pointed out, it makes no difference whatever which of these three views is adopted. The fact remains that this narrative, whether entirely or partially true, or wholly fictitious, does implicitly ascribe to God conduct which is unworthy of Him, if measured by the law of Christ, and does form part of Holy Scripture—part of that series of sacred writings of which divine inspiration is authoritatively predicated, and through which it has pleased God to educate mankind in the knowledge of Himself. The difficulty which thus forces itself on our notice is not touched by the allegation that the story is not true. Unhistorical traditions and erroneous physical conceptions, provided they are current, may be, and are, employed by inspired writers for edification, just as if they were true in themselves. It is not the truth, historically or physically, of the vehicle by which the teaching is conveyed that is the really important point, but the quality of the teaching itself. The quality here is in one respect bad, though the sacred writer is obviously unconscious of its imperfection, and if that be allowed, how can it be accounted for except by the explanation that the inspired writers were not necessarily infallible, and that in early times their conceptions of God fell much below those which Christ has taught us to form!

Allow me to add that your former correspondent, "C. C.," has equally mistaken the point of the difficulty. His argument that Jacob's fraud was punished by the subsequent calamities which fell upon him, does not touch the matter at all. It may be a justification of the *view of God which is given by the writer of the story*. The writer never connects Jacob's distresses with his fraud as being its punishment—never hints at his having done anything which deserved punishment. The entire representation is the other way. Blessing after blessing descends on the head of the deceiver. First, the stolen blessing by the bedside of the blind father; then the renewed blessing on his departure from his home; and lastly, the solemn blessing pronounced upon him by Almighty God at Bethel, crowning the whole fraud with the approbation of Heaven. I do not wonder at Mr. Murphy's exclaiming that he does not believe the story. But then how came this teaching about God to be an integral part of Holy Scripture?

PRESBYTER.

Reviews and Notices.

"CONFESSION." Edited by a Committee of Clergymen. Tenth thousand. Revised edition. London: Palmer, Little Queen Street. Price 1d.

THIS is a startling publication, widely circulated amongst the Crypto-Romanists, learning to be open Romanists, in England and Ireland. It states plainly that private confession is ordered by God (pp. 3, 4, 6, and 18), and that God pardons only those who confess privately to a priest (p. 4); and that those who are in doubt because they have not received God's pardon personally bestowed by a priest, on confession of the sin, are in the greatest danger of everlasting death (p. 5). Nonsense appears in this

book, as well as false doctrine. Thus, at p. 7, we are told, from some Popish directory, of course, that "it has been well said that what the priest has heard in confession, he knows less than what he has never heard at all." This is pure nonsense! A man cannot know anything less than what he does not know at all. At p. 6 we are told "that the priest can never, on any pretence, tell any one what he heard in confession." This is quite contrary to the old 64th Irish canon, as also to the 113th English ditto. Of course it has vanished in the present Puritanic-Irish canons. The old words were, "that he do not at any time reveal and make known to any person whatsoever, any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy (except they be such crimes as, by the laws of the realm, his own life may be called into question for concealing of the same). The Romish clergy will not reveal, even the purpose of murder, which might save a man's life, if made known in confession. At p. 6 we read the confessor "will kindly help you; he will ask you questions; you will answer openly, and then you will be relieved and happy." This questioning, which may be seen in its full abomination in Dens, and "The Priest in Absolution," so far from tending to make one "happy," is only calculated to pollute both questioner and questioned, with all kinds of abominable thoughts. Think of a wife being questioned as to all that passes between her husband and her! At p. 18 we read: "After absolution the penitent is pure and shining with grace before the face of God and of His angels." Alas! the unhappy wife or virgin may have her face clothed with shame at thought of what has been poured into her mind, if not, of what has been wrung from her. Such questioning, imposed by the books above mentioned, is calculated to set on fire the mind of the oldest priest and matron. Even if the clergyman were a married man, the effects would be abominable. But when the mind that has been so polluted is that of a young man, barely of age, bound to celibacy for life; and when the mind is that of a young girl, or even a matron, the whole system is one only fit to have been coined and hammered out in Hell itself. At p. 15 we read: "When you have received it . . . you are pure and spotless as on the day you were baptised." Alas! those who come away, after their minds being polluted by the suggestion of ideas never dreamt of before, can well tell whether they are as pure and spotless as those of infants. At p. 18 we are told that "it is well to go to confession at regular intervals." Of course there is nothing of all this in either Bible or Prayer-book. The Bible has literally nothing, except that the minister is to assure the doubting penitent that he is forgiven. Of confession, much less polluting questioning, it has not a hint. All the Prayer-book says is that those who are in doubt of their acceptance, may be assured of it if they can satisfy their clergyman that they are in a fit state. But now we come to the strangest part of the whole business. Some say that the editor of the *Church Times* is one of those who drew up this "Confession" directory. At any rate, the whole party are one *clique*. Well, what did we lately read in the *Church Times* for March 29th last? "Our own impression is that the Church acted very wisely indeed" in rescinding "the old canon obliging to confession, and leaving the matter to the private conscience, as stated in the Exhortation to the Communion." The editor then goes on to say that the "confessional did not restrain vice, that it was treated as a mere formality;

that, to keep people in the fold, the Word of God was handled deceitfully; that men were led to hate religion by their wives and daughters being forced to confess; and finally, that there is more morality in countries free from the confessional than in those of the Latin race, where it is submitted to." So we take leave of this book, and of the *Church Times*, leaving them to settle this little difference between themselves.

IN MEMORIAM.

WE have to record the death of the oldest City Incumbent, Prebendary Mackenzie, on the 16th inst. The Rev. Charles Mackenzie, Rector of All Hallows, Lombard Street, and Prebendary of St. Paul's, was born in 1807, and educated at Merchant Taylors' School, from whence he went to Pembroke College, Oxford, where he took honours. In 1832 he was appointed head master of St. Olave's Grammar School, Bermondsey, which post he held for twenty-five years. He was also vicar of Great St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, from 1836 to 1846, when he was appointed Rector of St. Benet's, Gracechurch Street, which church was taken down, and a new St. Benet's erected at Stepney, from the sale of the City site. In 1864 he succeeded to All Hallows and the united parishes.

Mr. Mackenzie has worked honourably and successfully as a parish clergyman, and was liked as a preacher; but the main work of his life was devoted to education. At the commencement of the Early Closing Movement he foresaw that extra time given to young men by "early closing," would do harm instead of good unless it were rightly used. This led him, in conjunction with a few earnest men, to found "Evening Classes for young men in the City of London" in 1848. The idea grew and expanded, and is now the "City of London College" under royal patronage, but those who see it now can scarcely realise the hard work, self-denying labour and pains bestowed upon it in its infancy and earlier stages by Mr. Mackenzie. He also assisted in establishing a college for young ladies, in Artillery Place, Finsbury Square, about 1850. He also formed classes both for men and women in connection with the Polytechnic.

For many years he was hon. sec. to the London Orphan Asylum, and took the greatest interest in the management and education of the children. The last few years have been passed in suffering and weakness, brought on chiefly by overwork in former years, but his interest in the welfare of others, and especially in the well-doing of young men, never flagged, and to them he has bequeathed a precious example of earnest persevering work under many difficulties, combined with a deep and quiet faith, which enabled him to do his duty steadfastly in that state of life in which God had placed him.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

A TABLET has been placed in the central porch of St. Nicholas', Warwick, containing the names of the rectors and vicars of the parish since the year 1274.

AN oak reredos, representing the Crucifixion and the patron saints of Great Britain and Ireland, designed by Mr. T. L. Moore, has been placed in St. Andrew's Church, Dunmore, N.B. The nucleus of the cost was provided from the surplus of the fund raised for the erection of the memorial window to the late Countess Dowager of Dunmore, who built and endowed the church, and the balance was provided by Mr. Claud Hamilton, Dunmore Park. A beautiful altar-cloth and hangings have been given by the Hon. Mrs. Claud Hamilton. The altar-frontal was worked by Miss Edith Wauchope, Airth Castle, and designed by Mr. Temple L. Moore.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Ainsley, Rev. Samuel Barber, Vicar of St. James's, Moss Side.
 Bayly Rev. Henry Eastfield, M.A., Rector of Fiddington, Somersetshire.
 Davies, Rev. A. J. P., B.A., Vicar of Aldsworth, Gloucestershire.
 Dougherty, Rev. John A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Garnet*.
 Durham, Rev. W. E., B.A., Rector of Eastdown, Barnstable; Vicar of St. Matthew the Apostle, Habergham Eaves, Burnley.
 Giles, Rev. Robert Harris, B.A., Vicar of St. Matthew the Apostle, Habergham Eaves, Burnley, Lancashire; Rector of Eastdown, Barnstable.
 Hoskyns, Rev. B. G., Curate of St. Mary's, Southampton; Incumbent of St. Denys, Southampton.
 Kelly, Rev. Canon, Rural Dean of Manchester Cathedral.
 Mosley, Rev. O. H., Vicar of Prickwillow; Rector of Wentworth.
 Ormsby, Rev. Watson King, Chaplain of St. Mary's Hospital, Paddington.
 Ottley, Rev. Henry Bickersteth, Rector of West Hackney Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Sussex.
 Petrie, Rev. Walter Layton, Vicar of Blackmore, Essex.
 Pott, Rev. A. Percival, Domestic Chaplain and Secretary to the Bishop of Wakefield.
 Sanderson, Rev. Charles Poyntz, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Robin Hood Gate, Kingston Vale.
 Stonex, Rev. Francis Tilney, M.A., Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Birkenhead; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chester.
 Watson, Rev. Charles Arthur, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Peter's, Glasgow.
 Weatherhead, Rev. Robert Johnston, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Seacombe; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chester.
 Williams, Rev. John W., Vicar of Rainford, Prescott.
 Woodward, Rev. Spencer A., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Saviour's, Paddington, W.; Vicar of Totternhoe, Beds.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allott, Rev. John, J.P., for fifty-two years Rector of the parish, at Maltby Rectory, Lincolnshire, on the 2nd inst., aged 76.
 Andrews, Rev. Robert, B.D., late Fellow of Emmanuel College, at Middleton Rectory, Essex, on the 28th ult., aged 89.
 Brooke, Rev. Joshua, B.A., for fifty-three years Vicar of Colston Bassett, at Colston Bassett Vicarage, on the 30th ult., aged 78.
 Nicholson, Rev. George J., at Egham, on the 15th inst.
 Pinder, Rev. Humphrey Senhouse, M.A., formerly Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and many years Rector of Bratton Fleming, at 3, Southernhay, Exeter, on the 22nd ult., aged 83.
 Tooth, Rev. George Chinnery, for upwards of twenty years Vicar of the parish, at the Vicarage, Codsall, aged 69.
 West, Rev. John, for fifty-six years Rector of the parish, at Aisholt Rectory, Bridgwater, on the 29th ult., aged 84.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

BY THE RIGHT REV. W. PAKENHAM WALSH,
D.D., BISHOP OF OSSORY.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PATRICK'S CATHEDRAL,
DUBLIN, ON MONDAY, APRIL 9TH, 1888, BE-
FORE THE CLERICAL AND LAY MEMBERS OF
THE GENERAL SYNOD.

"And the priests that bare the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, and all the Israelites passed over on dry ground, until all the people were clean passed over Jordan."—JOSHUA iii. 17.

"Take you twelve men out of the people, out of every tribe a man, and command ye them saying, 'Take you hence out of the midst of Jordan, out of the place where the priests' feet stood firm, twelve stones, and ye shall carry them over with you, and leave them in the lodging place where ye shall lodge this night.'"—JOSHUA iv. 2, 3.

THERE are voices that come to men from old battlefields which stir them up to valour and to duty, and there are echoes that come to the Church of God from its past conflicts, which are calculated to encourage and instruct us. The words of our text have this twofold character, and none of us could have listened to the story with which they stand connected without feeling that they are singularly appropriate to this occasion. We are to meet on the morrow to take counsel together for our beloved Church, and there is not a heart among us that is not more or less disquieted on account of its difficulties and dangers. On the nature of these difficulties and dangers this is not the time or place to enlarge. It is enough at present to remember that we are passing through a crisis, both social and political, which cannot but seriously affect our temporal condition as a Church, and that there lie behind it moral and spiritual dangers, which may well cause anxiety concerning its higher and more important interests. It is under the presence and pressure of these that we may turn to this narrative for lessons of wisdom and enjoyment. We need not recount the particulars of that wonderful miracle which closed the wanderings of Israel in the desert, and marked their entrance into Canaan. The crossing of Jordan on dry ground was to them an assurance of God's continued Presence, and an encouragement to face the fresh perils and the new duties which awaited them. The Ark of the Covenant, which had symbolised and manifested that Presence, for well nigh forty years, was still in the midst of them, and had now become inseparably connected with their safety and deliverance. Every Israelite who crossed dry-shod over Jordan

had to pass over within sight of that sacred shrine, which had been borne before them into the waters, and which remained there on the shoulders of the priests until all the people had passed over. What was a history full of meaning and encouragement to them, is a parable full of comfort and instruction to us. The most obvious but not the least important lesson to be gathered from the narrative, is one concerning the power and willingness of Almighty God to interpose for the preservation of His Church and people in times of need. These interpositions of His, in the days of old, are assurances that He can and will interpose on behalf of His people still, in the way and at the time that seem best to His unerring wisdom. Nor let us think now that the age of miracles is past, that such interferences are less real or less divine when they come to us in the ordinary workings of God's Providence. The Hand that gives us daily bread is the same that for forty years fed the hosts of Israel with bread from heaven; and the Hand that dries our tears of sorrow is the same which "made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over." That Hand can work by a miracle or without it. Be it ours to trust the love that guides it still, and to rely upon the power which always accompanies it. Another lesson to be gathered from the narrative is this, that our very difficulties may be God's chosen methods for achieving our deliverances, and that the very evils which we fear, like the clouds which we sometimes dread, may be "big with mercies," and may rain down showers of blessing. Who would have thought beforehand that the Red Sea would be the door from bondage to liberty, or that the swollen waters of the Jordan would be God's high-way into the promised land? Has not the history of the Church in all ages furnished abundant instances, wherein adversities have been converted into advantages, and obstacles proved to be the stepping stones to success? Are not we ourselves witnesses to the fact that the worst evils which have befallen us have not been unmixed evils after all? Did not the hearts of many amongst us almost fail, when the unrighteous measures of nineteen years ago burst like a thunder cloud upon our Church, and are we not ready to admit to-day that notwithstanding their unjustifiable character, they have at least cleared our spiritual atmosphere. Let us not then be disheartened ourselves, nor let us dishearten others by timid and unworthy forebodings. A brilliant writer in speaking not long since of the darkness of the political horizon hopefully said—"Be the gloom of the present times, short or long, it will not avail to hide the great and noble principles that are inevitably hastening a better and brighter future." It would be a disgrace to us, my brethren, if we were less hopeful about the cause of Christ than men of the world are, concerning the issues of mere earthly conflicts. God may be preserving us for a greater

work in this land than we have ever dreamt of. He may be preparing us for that work, if not by special interpositions, it may be by some of those trials which teach self-denial and self-sacrifice, and thus qualify men for nobler service. And He may be preparing the people for it in His own mysterious ways, by the driftings of human thought, by the surging of social revolution, by the disgust and distrust which are being engendered in many minds, as they see what they had thought to be religion basely pandering to passion, disloyalty, and greed. Revolutions of man's making, often pave the way for reformations of God's devising. Truth, like the Ark of the Covenant, is often carried in triumph through the very waters which threatened to engulf it. The overflowing of the Jordan on all its banks, was the unexpected preface to the conquest of the promised land. But in addition to these lessons of faith and hope (suggested by the narrative), there are others which teach the no less important ones of preparation and duty in view of present or apprehended dangers. And first we cannot but observe that as priests and people, in crossing the Jordan, had their several duties assigned to them by divine command, but all of them centring round the ark of God, so for us, clergy and laity, there are duties allotted, some of them in our separate capacities, but all of them, whether of a more sacred or more secular character, having reference to the maintenance of His truth. The ark was not only a pledge of God's Presence, but it was also the token of His covenant, the depository of His law, the embodiment of His ordinances; and around it, and with regard to it, both priests and people felt that they had common interests and common duties. My clerical and lay brethren, have we not something better in the midst of us than they had? Have we not that fuller deposit of divine truth which is to be at once our guide and guard? Have we not that glorious revelation of grace and mercy of which all these ordinances were but types and shadows? Surely it is at once our duty and our privilege unitedly to cherish and preserve that sacred trust. "The Church," says our 20th Article, is "to be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ," and by the Church we mean the whole body of the faithful, and not any one department of it. Our security, whether as individuals or as a community, is inseparably bound up with our fidelity to that truth which is committed to our care, and we are only safe so long as we give our humble submission to its divine authority, and our entire obedience to its heavenly teaching. What Bishop Butler has said about the happiness of the world is just as true about the safety of the Church—namely, "That it is the concern of Him Who is the Lord and Proprietor of it;" but, he adds, "Nor do we know what we are about when we endeavour to promote its good in any ways, but those which He has directed." But further. The

Ark of the Covenant preserved beneath its blood-besprinkled Mercy Seat not only the tables of the law, but "the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded." Have not we, my brethren, (in addition to that Blessed Gospel which tells us of the true and only propitiation for our sins,) the baptism wherein we put on Christ, and the bread and chalice of communion wherein we spiritually feed on him, and have we not a divinely appointed ministry which has come down to us from apostolic days? Can we be too thankful for these and other privileges, and can we be too earnest in maintaining them in all their integrity, guarding them against the corruptions of superstitions and the assaults of unbelief. This is a duty to which all of us are pledged, both by our Christianity and our churchmanship, and it is a heritage which both clergy and laity are solemnly bound to hand down unimpaired to those that come after them. Only let us remember that the possession of the Ark without the Presence of God availed Israel nothing, when once the glory had departed; and that even divine ordinances without His blessing will not save us from discomfiture and defeat. Let therefore the prayer of Moses be evermore our own—"If Thy Presence go not with us carry us not up hence." You will observe that the position assigned by Joshua to the priests, was not only the post of distinction but of danger. They were to be the first to enter the waters of the river, and they were to be the last to leave its bed. They took up the burden on their shoulders (though it was not their ordinary duty) and did not think themselves disparaged; they remained to the last in the midst of apparent peril, and did not shrink because they were exposed. The command specially given to them was—"When ye come into the waters ye shall stand still"; the testimony borne to them is—"The priests that bore the Ark stood firm." It was the firmness of faith and patience, and that firmness contributed to the safety of Israel. Brethren in the ministry, what a lesson is here for us? Our office, as the Ordination Service well reminds us, is of "great excellency and of great difficulty." We must, therefore, endeavour to be examples to our people. We are not to shrink when danger threatens, and we are to be firm when trial comes and while trial lasts. We are not to be hasty in leaving our appointed posts without sufficient cause; and we are ever to bear in mind that, humanly speaking, the salvation of souls depends on our fidelity. It was a blessing to Israel that they had such priests that day; it will be a blessing to the Church of Ireland if evermore it has such clergy—men who trust in Christ themselves, men who preach Christ to others, and men who live for Christ amidst their flocks. But now as to the people. It had been announced to them that "within three days they should pass over this Jordan," and relying on that promise they marched onwards towards the swelling flood;

and then keeping the Ark in view, they ventured boldly after it, along the wondrous pathway which it had cleared for them; and throughout all that long eventful day, the mighty host advanced, "until all the people had passed clean over Jordan." It is said they "hasted and passed over," but it was not the haste of terror or unbelief. This is plain; for they knew that there were foes beyond the river, and the walls of Jericho frowned upon them at no great distance. It was the haste of confidence and duty. They knew in whom they had believed, and so were strengthened to go onward in the name of the Lord. My brethren of the laity, can we place a nobler example before you? Can we desire a better attitude for you in any crisis of our Church's history? You know something of the difficulties that surround you; you may be able to form some estimate of the dangers that lie before you; and yet you may be unable to form any conception of how they are to be overcome. But put your trust in the living God; stay yourselves upon His promises and go forward in His strength. The very impediments in your way will only magnify the grace of God. "In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength." "He that believeth shall not make haste." "Be strong and of a good courage." And here let me observe that the way to be prepared for difficulties is not by constantly expecting them, or morbidly brooding upon them, but by that habitual faith, and that continual discipline of obedience, which will enable us to meet them should they arise. It has been well said that "the daily life of the man who meets every duty as something to be done for Christ, and bears every trial as something to be endured for Christ, has its result not only in the doing of these duties, and the bearing of these trials, but also in the deposit of reserve force which is left thereby in his character for future emergencies." If it be true, as Fuller has reminded us, that "a man has only so much religion as he can command in the hour of trial," it is equally true, both of individuals and communities, that it is our previous character which is revealed by a crisis, and that our difficulties become the test not only of our sincerity but of our attainments. Keep therefore your eyes fixed, like the men of Israel, on the Ark of God, and go on in the path of duty. Remember as Christians, as churchmen, and as patriots, that religion leads the van in all true progress, whether it be of Churches or of Kingdoms, and that we are never and nowhere so secure as in our appointed sphere of duty. There is a counsel of the Psalmist which is specially applicable at the present times—"Put thou thy trust in the Lord, and be doing good: dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed." But we must not forget the two-fold memorial which Israel was directed to set up—the one at Gilgal, where they were to encamp; and the other in the river through which they had

safely passed. The one was exalted and visible from afar; the other, oftentimes concealed beneath the rising floods. Both were taken from the place where the priests' feet stood firm, and both were erected by twelve men chosen from amongst the tribes. Here, then, was a union of clergy and of laity. For, if the Ark was borne by the priests, these stones were carried and set up by the representatives of the people. And when did marble arch or stately column ever recall such glorious memories of the past, or furnish such incentives to the future, as these rude stones? How a sight of them would stir up the present generation not only to praise and adoration, but to resolution and bravery, and encourage their children in after ages to cleave to the pure faith of their fathers, and to resist the idolatries which surrounded them. Brethren, have we as a united clergy and laity no memorials to erect in remembrance of past mercies? Have we no safeguards to provide for those who are to come after us? I trust that our service this evening in this our National Cathedral has been one such memorial, and that we have been setting up an Ebenezer each one in our hearts, beside saying, "Hitherto hath the Lord helped us." And in the work of reconstruction which we have been permitted to carry on from year to year in our synods, as representative men, I trust that we have done something that will be both a memorial of the past and a help towards perpetuating true religion in our country. Is it nothing that, through God's assistance, not only have our twelve Bishops been preserved amidst the overthrow, but that a new one has been added, or, rather, an old one revived? It is nothing that by His help so much has been done towards continuing our parochial system throughout the length and breadth of the land, thus securing the means of grace to all our people? It is nothing that amidst great depression churches and cathedrals have been rebuilt or restored, and that agencies for home and foreign missions have been so wonderfully sustained? Is it nothing that our Church, suddenly disestablished and disendowed, has framed for herself a Constitution, which, whatever be its faults in the eyes of some, has called forth the admiration of many, and the envy of not a few. The declaration prefixed to that Constitution is in itself a proof of the goodness and wisdom by which God has guided us in a time of peculiar difficulty. It would be well if that declaration were printed and widely circulated as an exponent of our scriptural character and our Catholic position, as the ancient Church of this land. Let me recite three brief paragraphs from that interesting document:—I. "The Church of Ireland doth, as heretofore, accept and unfeignedly believe all the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given by inspiration of God, and containing all things necessary to salvation; and doth continue to profess the faith of Christ, as professed

by the Primitive Church. II. The Church of Ireland will continue to administer the doctrines and Sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded; and will maintain inviolate the three orders of Bishops, Priests or Presbyters, and Deacons, in the sacred ministry. III. The Church of Ireland, as a reformed and Protestant Church, doth hereby re-affirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the primitive faith had been from time to time defaced or overlaid, and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject." We cannot stay to point out the importance of each of these declarations: but I may be permitted to quote, in connection with the last of them, some striking thoughts of the late great prelate of this See, whose piety and Churchmanship will ever give weight to the counsels which he has bequeathed to us. Archbishop Trench, presiding at the Synod of Ossory, when it was electing a successor to Bishop O'Brien, after referring to the sermons of that distinguished prelate on "The Nature and Effects of Faith," used the following words:—"When I speak, as I have a right to speak, of that book, I know very well that other theological interests have, during the last few years, so occupied men's thoughts and minds, that the Reformation theology—the great truths which the Reformation brought into their proper prominence again—are for us scarcely so prominent, I fear for some not so precious, as once they were. I can only say the more's the pity. But this will not be always thus; and of this I feel sure, that so long as the Church of Ireland holds fast her Eleventh Article, she will have in honour him who so vindicated against all gainsayers the doctrine therein declared as 'wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.'" We have spoken of the visible memorials which have marked our passage through the late eventful years. May we not hope, and ought we not to pray, that others of a kind which are sometimes less visible, but which are always more important, may be continually rising up around us. I mean those living stones which constitute the temple of the Holy Ghost, and which are built up silently and often unobservedly upon that One Foundation which is Jesus Christ. It is for this great end our Church exists; it is for this its ministry, its sacraments, and its ordinances are to be maintained; it is this which gives value and importance to our consultations; it is this which lends sacredness even to our financial and secular arrangements. Let it therefore be dearer to us than all beside. Nor let us forget what need we have of the grace and guidance of the Holy Spirit, so that all our works and counsels may be effectual. Through His divine blessing much has been accomplished; but "there remaineth yet very much land to be possessed;" and we need that "right judgment in all things" which He alone can bestow, and

that blessing of His without which "nothing is strong, nothing is holy." In conclusion, there is one solemn personal lesson for each of us to lay to heart, when we remember that between ourselves and the promised rest, there lies a Jordan which we must one day cross, and in which we shall need the Presence and help of Him, who has said to each true Israelite—"When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee, and through the rivers they shall not overflow thee." The Church militant amongst us is fast hastening on its march through this desert world, and we are soon to follow those who have already joined the Church triumphant in Heaven.

* * * * * Our little life

Is interwoven with the universe

Of God's eternal counsels. We are part

Of the whole family in Heaven and earth—

Part of the mighty host whose foremost ranks

Long since have crossed the river and have pitch'd

Their tents upon the everlasting hills.

How shrunken Jordan must have seemed to them.

It is a solemn thing to have stood in the pulpit to-night in place of one who has lately crossed that flood, one who was to have addressed us on this occasion, but who has been called away most unexpectedly and, alas! as we would think, too soon—the late gifted and lamented Provost of Trinity College.* He has entered upon his rest; but what a blank he has left, not only in the world of science, but in the Church of Christ. His fine familiar presence, and his calm and thoughtful counsels will be sorely missed from amongst us on the morrow, and indeed for many a long, long year to come. We miss to-night the weighty words which would have fallen from the lips which so often have instructed us; but the sad event which has deprived us of his counsel, is in itself a more telling sermon than any that even he, with all his eloquence, could possibly have preached to us. "He being dead yet speaketh." He has left us an example of sincerity and earnestness, of courage, diligence, and consistency, which we may humbly try to imitate, but can never hope to excel. May we be enabled to serve the Master as faithfully as he did; may our feet stand as firm in life and death as his did; may our precious Saviour be with us as He was with him, when we come to cross the river; and may we each receive from our true Joshua—Jehovah-Jesus—the same blessed welcome which, we doubt not, greeted him when he reached the farther shore—"Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!"

THE Rev. F. J. Jayne, vicar of Leeds, will preach the sermon at the consecration in York Minster of Canon Pulleine as Bishop of Penrith, on Tuesday. This will be the first consecration of a Bishop-Suffragan in the Northern Province.

* Rev. J. H. Jellett, D.D.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY.** IF POSSIBLE, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C.B. HARNESSE, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains **ADVICE HOW**, in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation. **OBESITY IS CURED**, and will return the system to its normal state. Present, gratis and post free, on application to the

Medical Battery Company, Limited.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 19, 1888.

THE POPE AND THE PLAN.

THE action of the Pope in proclaiming the Plan of Campaign and the practice of boycotting as contrary to "faith and morals," marks an era in Irish history. Up to a very recent date the Church of Rome in Ireland steered its course entirely within the law. So long as Cardinal Cullen and Cardinal McCabe held the reins of church government in Ireland rebellion was declared to be as the sin of witchcraft, and nothing was left undone on the part of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to assist the authorities in the suppression of revolutionary movements. Indeed, one of the chief features in the Fenian conspiracy was the fierce antagonism displayed by its leaders and its organ in the press, *The Irish People*, to the whole of the priesthood. Cardinal Cullen continually denounced the movement from the altar, and the inferior clergy gave all the assistance in their power to the Government in the work of scotching the insurrection. This policy was consistently followed until the death of Cardinal McCabe in 1885. His death in 1885 was a severe blow to the cause of law and order in Ireland, for from that moment a new and unfortunate departure was taken in the relation of the priests to politics. By dint of incessant representations at Rome, Archbishop Walsh was promoted to the supreme government of the Church of Rome in Ireland, having previously made his terms with Mr. Parnell and the Nationalist party. With a few honourable exceptions the whole priesthood fell into line with the National League, urged on its policy, led the van in boycotting, and made superhuman efforts to make the Law of the League superior to the Law

of the Land. In 1886 the Chicago Convention took place, and Mr. Parnell was directly represented there by two delegates, Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., and Mr. John Redmond, M.P. It was there decided that the Plan of Campaign should be adopted as one of the means of making the Government of Ireland impossible during the coming winter, and it was formally adopted as the Irish revolutionary policy. The Plan was published as a political document on October 23rd, 1886, in *United Ireland*. On December 2nd, Archbishop Walsh declared, in an interview, that he saw nothing in the Plan contravening justice and morality, and this approval was duly heralded with a flourish of trumpets by the Parnellite press. The *Freeman's Journal* declared that "if there had been any moral wrong in the Plan it would have been imperative on the heads of the Catholic Church to condemn it, no matter how lamentable the temporal consequences might be to the people." The highest legal authorities, however, took quite a different view of the case. On December 14th, 1886, the Plan was declared by the Queen's Bench Division to be utterly illegal, and on January 14th, 1887, the Bankruptcy Court declared it to be a fraud upon creditors, and the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Land Acts mentioned it as one of the chief causes of the depression of the land market. With a few exceptions all the leading statesmen in England, and the press of the world, even including the *Daily News*, denounced Mr. Dillon's scheme as immoral and anarchical. When, however, the action of Archbishop Walsh was quickly followed by a letter addressed by Archbishop Croke to the public press advocating a no-tax movement in Ireland, the Pope seems to have taken alarm. The case of Dr. McGlynn, of New York, which had also at that time come into prominence, was under consideration at Rome, and the necessity of excommunicating that unruly political priest, probably decided Leo XIII. on sending a special envoy to Ireland to make independent inquiries into the state of affairs, ecclesiastical and political. The result was the mission of Monsignor Persico. That dignitary arrived in Ireland in the early summer of last year, and has devoted himself for the past ten months to the difficult task of discovering the truth about the National League and the Parnellite party. For the first time the representative of the Pope has now heard both sides of the complex Irish question. All classes and all creeds waited upon Monsignor Persico, and laid plain statements of fact, attested by documentary evidence, before him. He visited every diocese and was made acquainted with every phase of the programme of the National League. He had ocular demonstration of the action of social excommunication of the Plan of Campaign and of the relation which the priesthood held to these two mainsprings of Irish agitation and crime, and he reported thereon. That is the plain un

varnished fact about Monsignor Persico's mission, and it is hardly surprising that the Parnellite party are at their wits' end to discount the important results which have followed from that mission. The Pope has at last put down his foot. He has reversed the decision of Archbishop Walsh, and he has declared that the judgment of the Queen's Bench, delivered, it is worth noting, by a Roman Catholic judge, is binding upon all good citizens who profess the faith of Rome. This remarkable pronouncement, tardy as it is, has spread confusion amongst the Parnellite party. Moreover, it was totally unexpected. The week before its promulgation *United Ireland* declared the rumour that the Pope was about to interfere was ludicrous and insulting—the thing was, of course, utterly incredible and absurd. Afterwards it said, "It is, indeed, a humiliating spectacle for the Irish Catholic people to see the Vatican and the Castle in alliance, to behold the Papal benediction bestowed on land-grabbing and eviction." Such language proves what a death-blow has been struck at social disorder by the Pope's decree. It means simply that henceforth the priesthood will be eliminated as a militant body from the Parnellite army on pain of excommunication, so far as boycotting and the Plan of Campaign are concerned. As these two weapons are, in fact, the backbone of the conspiracy against the payment of rent and the revolutionary movement for separation, it is sufficiently obvious that the political paralysis of the Irish priesthood which the Pope's decree must insure will affect the whole action of the peasantry.

THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.

(Continued from page 213.)

CHAPTER VI.

BRIAN BORU.

BUT the miserable condition of the country was not destined to remain always without an avenger. To this period belongs a name which has always been held in honour by his countrymen in every succeeding age—the celebrated Brian Boru, or Boromhe king of Ireland, who delivered the island from the tyranny of the Danes. While yet serving as general to his brother the king of Munster, he had defeated the Danes in several encounters. In 980 Maelseachlin or Malachy II. came to the throne; Brian Boru was the son of Kenedy, king of Munster, and when Mahon his brother had been basely murdered by conspirators, he succeeded him on the throne, where his energy, military skill, and prudence soon made him formidable to the Danes, and an object of jealousy and suspicion to Malachy, king of Ireland. Malachy, however, was a wise ruler and a brave and skilful warrior. Soon after his accession he routed the Danes in the battle of Tara with such slaughter of their best and bravest chiefs, that Anliffe their king died shortly

after, of despair and grief. The battle of Tara was fought in 980: between two such men as Malachy and Brian, cordial co-operation could hardly be looked for. Accordingly, we are not surprised to find them engaged in constant feuds; several leagues were made between the two rivals, but they were broken almost as soon as made. At last in 1001 Brian compelled Malachy to resign the crown of Ireland, and henceforth to rest content with the throne of Meath.

Brian ascended the throne of Ireland in 1001. He had organised in South Munster a formidable body of militia called the Dalcais. He stormed Dublin, the stronghold of the Danish power, and reduced its inhabitants to submission. He subdued by force of arms the greater part of the island, and the Irish, won by his warlike renown and brilliant qualities, hailed him as a heaven-sent deliverer. Under his firm administration the country was reduced to such a state of peace and obedience to law, that a young lady adorned with valuable jewels is said to have travelled through the kingdom unattended, free from injury or insult. The lawless were terrified into submission, and the havoc made by centuries of war and feud was repaired. Monasteries, churches and colleges began once more to start into existence, and the peasantry again turned their attention to the almost forgotten arts of husbandry and tillage. To meet the Danish incursions, Brian fitted out a strong fleet, but the preparations of the Ard Righ were rudely interrupted by a fresh inroad of his terrible foes. If Brian had had only the Danes to deal with, it is probable that he would easily have reduced them to complete subjection; but his resolute administration had raised up against him many enemies, and some of the turbulent septa were never wanting when an occasion offered itself of waging war against the Ard Righ. Before the accession of Brian, Meath had always been regarded as the royal province, but the southern branch of the Hy Niall had been for some time steadily declining in power and influence, until finally, in 1001, it fell before the superior address and courage of the warlike Brian. He had turned his arms against Ulster, and burned to the ground the palace of the Northern Hy Niall. But the Irish grew impatient under the rule of the new Ard Righ; Leinster rose in open revolt and made common cause with the Danes, who were strengthened by the arrival of fresh hordes. At the age of eighty-eight, the Ard Righ was once more summoned into the field to maintain with the sword the rights which his sword had won.

The wife of Brian Boru was sister of Maolmordha-mac Murchada, king of Leinster, who had been raised to the throne by the influence of the Danes in 999. This prince being at an entertainment at the court of Brian at Kincora, saw Morogh, the son of Brian, at a game of chess, and advised his opponent to a move which cost Morogh the game. Morogh, indignant at his interference, in the heat of passion, reproached him with having given to the Danes treacherous advice by which they lost the battle of Glen-Mama: "If you had given them such good advice," said he, "the Danes would not have got such an overthrow," "Next time," was the angry reply, "my advice shall guide them to victory." Morogh contemptuously defied him. The quarrel thus begun was artfully inflamed by Gormlaith, the wife of Brian, who had been previously married to Anlaf Cuaran, Danish king of Dublin, by whom she was mother of Sitric, the present prince of that city. After leaving Kincora, the king of Leinster collected his nobles and urged

them to throw off the yoke of the Ard Righ. The Danes were invited to join the confederacy, and the king of Denmark sent twelve thousand men under his two sons to help against the oppressor of the Danes. Sweden, Norway, Britain, and the Orkneys, sent troops to swell the allied forces which mustered on the plains of Moynalta near Dublin, now called Clontarf. Thither Brian advanced with the septs of Munster and Connaught, the trained warriors who had followed his standard in many a wild foray and on many a stricken field: Thither too came Malachy, king of Meath, to support Brian with one thousand men. The allies were drawn up in three divisions: the first consisted of one thousand Northmen armed in coats of mail, and the Danes of Dublin led by Dolat and Conmaol: the second consisted of nine thousand Lagenians, commanded by king Maolmordha in person: the third division was composed of the various bands from different regions—the fierce warriors of the Orkneys and the Western Isles, the wild sea rovers of Scandinavia, adventurers from Cornwall, Neustria, Denmark, and Wales—who had swarmed into Ireland at the alarm of war to aid the Danish power. This division was led by Sigurd, earl of the Orkneys, and the sea king Brodar. Brian, undismayed by this warlike array, drew up his army in three divisions: Morogh led the first, Kian and Donald, two Eugenic chieftains, commanded the second: the third was led by Teige O'Connor, son of the king of Connaught. The Northmen under Brodar insisted that the battle should be fought on Good Friday, April 23. When the signal was given that morning at sunrise, Malachy, who had not forgotten his old grudge against Brian, deserted his post and drew up his men upon a neighbouring hill from which he watched the fortune of the field. Brian took no part in the battle, but Morogh proved himself on that day no degenerate son of a noble sire; he performed prodigies of valour, and Sigurd, earl of the Orkneys, fell by his hand. The issue remained long doubtful, and it was not till 4 o'clock in the evening that the Danes began to give way. Morogh and Anrud met in single conflict, and the latter fell pierced through and through by the sword of his impetuous assailant, but as he fell he grasped the skeyne of Morogh and plunged it into his body. The Irish chieftain died the next day. The Danes began to give way in all directions, and the Irish rushing forward in pursuit, the tent of the king was left unguarded. Brodar, with a small body of flying Danes, came unexpectedly upon it, and Brian Boru was slain in the struggle which followed; Brodar was taken by the followers of the Ard Righ and put to death. Few of the Danish leaders escaped slaughter on that eventful day. Maolmordha was among the slain, and the Irish lost besides Brian and Morogh almost all their distinguished chiefs.

The body of Brian was borne in solemn procession by the monks to the Monastery of Swords, thence to the Church of St. Kieran. Here it was met by the monks of Louth, who bore it to the abbey of Louth; thither came the Archbishop of Armagh with his suffragans and clergy to receive the corpse, and to bear it in funeral procession to the ancient cathedral of Armagh, where it lay for twelve days and nights watched over by the clergy; after which they laid the remains of the illustrious dead with great pomp and bitter mourning beside the high altar of the Church of St. Patrick. The battle of Clontarf was fought on April 23, 1014. After the battle the Irish marched

sullenly homewards, for the slaughter of their chiefs had been terrible, and their hearts were sore in spite of victory. The Southern septs had lost almost all their leaders, and the Dalcais had lost their great captain. The Danes too had received a blow from the effects of which they never recovered in Ireland, and the accounts of this hard-fought field spread mourning and grief through many a distant settlement of the rovers of the seas. Malachy seized his opportunity and recovered much of the power of which Brian had deprived him; he reigned as Ard Righ until his death, September 2, 1022. But although Malachy proved himself capable of holding the advantages won by Brian, it is certain that the Danes continued to retain their settlements; their maritime cities were still governed by their own kings, their church was ruled by laws independent of the Irish Church, and their prelates were sent for consecration to the Archbishop of Canterbury. They had embraced the Christian Faith before this period, and the battle of Clontarf shattered into atoms the expiring heathenism which still lingered among them. Their warrior gods with their magic spells had fallen before a mightier creed, and henceforth the Irish Danes appear to have accepted more fully the Christian Faith as it had been propagated by missionaries among their countrymen at home. Those missionaries had brought with them Roman customs and the Roman use, and hence it came that Roman influence was first introduced into Ireland through the settlements of the Danish power. We shall now see how this Danish Church in Ireland became first Anglo-Danish and then Anglo-Irish. We may observe here that Maelmurry, Archbishop of Armagh, in the reign of Brian, was a married man—that his family had held the see of Armagh for two centuries, handing it down in many cases from father to son: a significant fact which proves that in those days clerical celibacy was not compulsory in the Church of Ireland. It is also noteworthy that at this early period there were two Churches in Ireland differing in constitution, deriving orders and consecration from different sources, and by no means inclined to look favourably on one another.

It seems very evident that even after the Norman Invasion and the Synod of Cashel, there were in spite of Synodal decrees two churches in the country, the Anglo-Irish Church of the Pale and the Irish Church of the Septs, and these two Churches continued in existence down to the Reformation, theoretically united but practically distinct.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ANGLO-DANISH CHURCH IN IRELAND.— ROMEWARD TENDENCIES. 1040-1155.

HITHERTO we have traced the history of a free people. The Irish Church had resisted for a long time Roman intrusiveness. The Irish nation had struggled with obstinate determination against Danish encroachments, and had successfully resisted the establishment of a permanent Danish dynasty in the island. Now we enter upon a new era, marked by humiliation and national subjugation. In England Romish influence was first introduced by the conversion of the Saxons, a conversion brought about by the mission of Augustine in 596. In Ireland the influence of the Danes led to the same result. The first indication of an interest in religion on the part of the Irish Danes

appears in the election of Donatus, or Dunanus, to the bishopric of Dublin in 1040. About the same time the cathedral of Christ Church was founded. On the death of Donatus, in 1074, Patrick was next selected as bishop by the Danes of Dublin, and sent to Canterbury for consecration at the hands of Lanfranc. Lanfranc at this time wrote a letter to Gothric, king of the Danes of Dublin, and another to Turlogh, king of Ireland, and grandson of Brian Boru. "Our brother and fellow-bishop Patrick," wrote Lanfranc to the Ard Righ, "has spoken so much and so warmly of the pious humility of your highness towards the good, your strict severity against the bad, and your truly discreet equity towards every class of persons, that although we have never seen you, yet we love you as if we had, and wish to consult your interest and to render you our most sincere service as if we had seen you, and been intimately acquainted with you."

But although the character of the Irish king is thus highly commended by the English patriarch, yet he complains of several abuses which then existed in the Irish Church, and besought him to use his influence to have them amended. He notes amongst others that men were in the habit of deserting their lawful wives without just cause, marrying others related to themselves or to the wives thus put away, that bishops were consecrated by one bishop only, that infants were baptised without consecrated chrism, that holy orders were conferred by bishops for money. Complaints of a similar nature occur in the letters of Anselm, successor to Lanfranc. The jurisdiction exercised by bishops gave special offence to those English patriarchs whose ideas on such points were in perfect accordance with the arrangements of Rome. The material point, however, to be noted here is, that a connection with Canterbury was established which continued for a long time, and that through Canterbury Roman practices, Roman customs and Roman influence were established in the Irish Church. Donatus, third bishop of Dublin, was consecrated at Canterbury by Lanfranc, in 1085. Samuel, fourth bishop of Dublin, was consecrated at Canterbury by Anselm, in 1095. Malchus, first bishop of Waterford, was consecrated in 1096 at Canterbury. Gregory, bishop of Dublin, was consecrated at Canterbury 1121. On the occasion of the consecration of Gregory, the citizens and clergy of Dublin sent a letter to the English primate, in which they mention that: "the bishops of Ireland have great indignation toward us, and that bishop most of all that dwelleth at Armagh, because we will not obey their ordination, but will always be under your government." Gregory afterwards became archbishop of Dublin, and the Irish Church thenceforward ceased to have any relation to the see of Canterbury, but the Roman influence thus introduced did not cease, but continued to gain ground until it was firmly established by the mission of Paparo, in 1151.

Malchus, bishop of Waterford, entered very zealously into the views of the Roman party, and Gillebert, bishop of Limerick, who had been educated in Normandy, attached himself likewise to the Papal influence. From what has been already stated we may gather that the authority of the see of Canterbury extended only to the Danish cities of Dublin, Waterford and Limerick, that even in those places it went no farther than the consecration of bishops, that the authority thus exercised was not acknowledged by the ancient Church of Ireland. There were, in fact,

then in existence two distinct branches of the Church in the island; the Danish Church, deriving orders from Canterbury, and the Irish Church, which acknowledged the authority of the archbishop of Armagh. The Ostmans were most anxious to sever themselves from the Irish and to be regarded as Normans, while the Irish viewed with jealousy every attempt to infringe upon the rights of their own patriarch.*

The Synod of Rathbreasail, which assembled in 1110, inaugurated a complete revolution in the Irish Church. At this Synod, for the first time, a Papal Legate presided at an Irish ecclesiastical council, Gillebert, first bishop of the Danish city of Limerick, acting in that capacity. Now, too, an effort was made to reduce to something like order the diocesan system. The island was divided into twenty-four dioceses—twelve in the north, subject to Armagh, and twelve in the south, subject to Cashel—exclusive of Dublin, which still remained subject to Canterbury. The reforms introduced into the Church by those who favoured Roman influence, the zeal, learning and piety of men like Gillebert, the abuses which had made their way into the old system, these and many other causes contributed to strengthen that party which co-operated with the bishop of Limerick in his efforts to reform and reconstruct the ecclesiastical edifice. Of those who entered zealously into this task Malachy, afterwards archbishop of Armagh, was by far the most eminent and influential. An ardent reformer of abuses, a diligent student, an admirer of order and decency in public worship, a man of great personal piety, Malachy rose early to eminence, and on the death of Primate Celsus in 1129, he was chosen to fill the office of archbishop of Armagh. He introduced the customs of the Roman Church, encouraged the practice of chanting and singing at the canonical hours, instructed the people in confession, confirmation, and the sanctity of the marriage contract. In 1139 Malachy paid a visit to Rome, to solicit from the supreme Pontiff the pallium, an ornamental vestment conferred by the bishop of Rome upon his archbishops, which no archbishop of Armagh had hitherto received. The Pontiff received Malachy graciously, and made many inquiries respecting Ireland and her Church.

"But with respect to the palls," he said, "that we must manage in a more solemn manner. You must summon together the bishops and clergy and the nobles of your land, and hold a general council of them. And in this way, with the consent and by the common desire of all, you can then send over for the pall by respectable agents, and it shall be given you." This council was not, however, summoned, but Eugenius III. sent over Cardinal Paparo, in 1151, with four palls for the Irish archbishops, and four archbishoprics were constituted by Paparo, at Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, and Connaught, or Tuam. In 1152 Paparo, as papal Legate, presided at the Synod of Kells, which assembled to receive and distribute the palls, and to rectify ecclesiastical abuses. Between the visit of Malachy and the arrival of Paparo, we have no account of any one having gone to solicit the palls, but probably the bishop of Rome deemed it prudent not to wait for further solicitation in a matter of such

* King, "Church History of Ireland," ii. pp. 419-451. Rev. W. G. Todd, "Church of St. Patrick," pp. 44, 45. Killen, "Ecclesiastical History of Ireland," i. pp. 162-175. Wordsworth, "Church of Ireland," pp. 90, 91. Gieseler, "Ecclesiastical History," ii. p. 195. (Fourth Edition.) Ussher, "Religion of the Ancient Irish," chap. viii.

importance. Several Irish bishops declined to attend the Synod, but more than twenty bishops, together with abbots, princes, nobles and representative clergy and laymen assembled at the council. A few years later the Pope, Adrian IV., granted the kingdom of Ireland to Henry II., king of England, directing, "that in order to widen the bounds of the Church, to check the spread of vice, to reform the state of morals, and promote the inculcation of virtuous dispositions" the Norman king should enter Ireland, and hold it as a lordship, paying to the Pope a yearly tribute of one penny for every house therein.*

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

PREACHING.

SIR,—The *Standard* had some suggestive letters lately on "preaching" in our Church generally, and in London particularly. Some of the writers referred to the numerous calls on the clergy in visiting and organisation. The writers were kindly inclined to their clergy, and while they were really defending "the hard-worked clergy" as a body, they were biassed by their personal regard for some one good man, their own parson. Two other correspondents wrote *ad rem*. One, the vicar of Tenby, gave some wholesome advice as to clerical work, and as to its due proportions outside and inside the parson's study. Another writer told some anecdotes, not more amusing than pointed; but the particular anecdote advising the thoughtful preacher going forth from his study to the pulpit to leave all his best thoughts behind him if he wished to "make an impression," is much more true than the laity may allow, who don't read their Bibles.

The preacher (as is often said) is very differently placed to the judge and the pleader. The cases on which they adjudicate or plead are ever varying with all their allowed relationships. The audience, too, is everchanging, and they come into court with hearts and heads all alive to matters which they hear. The points to which preachers might give more attention are twofold. Men have to be taught through their reasoning heads and feeling hearts that the "old, old

story" is not a worn out tale to be told and slept over. Men have to feel that the preacher, in London at least, is abreast of the thought of to-day.

The "hard-worked clergy" and those of them who plead the work of "serving tables" as all engrossing and all important, seemingly do not agree with some of the correspondents in the *Standard*, that this age is an intelligent age, asking for bread and not a stone. The hard workers in "serving tables" forget the great Preacher's and Exemplar's words, "These things ye ought to have done, and not leave the other undone." In too many instances in London—the centre of the world in intelligence, wealth and earnestness—"serving tables" takes the place of preaching to men's heads and hearts with such wisdom and power, as the humblest parson may gain, if he bears in mind the great Preacher's words, "Ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full," and really studies his subject matter as a young barrister does his brief; St. Paul's address at Athens cannot be studied by the majority of London preachers, or the complaints in the *Standard* letters would not have been made.

St. Paul was "a university man." He had "the care of all the Churches" on his mind and heart, but yet "he rose to the occasion" in the thoughtful Athens. This is just what the majority of London preachers seldom do. They resort to the "Flamen's Vestry" as a substitute for wholesome food. Many of these are no doubt excellent men, who can point to their full churches as a complete answer to all critics. They forget the fact that our church-going population must go somewhere, and the church accommodation is altogether inadequate to the wants of churchmen. Daily services and recurring celebrations are multiplied. The attendance on these numerous services are small in comparison to the surrounding multitudes. The clergy are so taken up with officiating in these matters during the week, that they can plead being pretty well "used up" by Sunday.

If the clergy wish to get out of newspaper criticism on preaching, they must face the position and apply themselves more to that kind of work which their critics wish done better. When they clearly see the value of preaching as a great means to great ends, we may look for more "church life."

OBSERVER.

May 12th, 1888.

CONFESSION.

SIR,—In the review of "Confession" in to-day's PULPIT, I read: "There is nothing of all this in either Bible or Prayer Book. The Bible has literally nothing, except that the minister is to assure the doubting penitent that he is forgiven. Of confession, much less polluting questioning, it has not a hint. All the Prayer Book says is, that those who are in doubt of their acceptance, may be assured of it if they can satisfy their clergyman that they are in a fit state."

The Bible speaks of the commission to Christian ministers to proclaim the Gospel, which promises salvation from their sins to all who truly repent of them. There is nothing in the Bible to warrant declaration of particular salvation to any individual, neither is there anything in the Prayer Book to that effect. The absolution in the Visitation Service is

* The Bull of Adrian IV. may be seen in King, "History of the Church of Ireland, iii., Appendix, pp. 1045-1053. Ussher, "Sylloge," No. 46 and Notes. The Bull is referred to and acknowledged by Pope Alexander III. in his Bull confirming the grant of Adrian in 1172. King, iii. Appendix p. 1053.

Compare Killen, "Ecc. Hist.," i. p. 209. Lanigan, iv. 164-166. Sir John Davies, "True Discoverie," pp. 12-15, Reprint of 1747. Wright, "Hist. of Ireland," vol. i. pp. 85, 86. In 1318 the nobles of Ireland wrote a complaint of the tyranny of the English to Pope John XXII., in which they expressly state that in 1170 Pope Adrian "made over the dominion of this realm of ours in a certain set form of words to that prince, whom, for the crime here mentioned" (the murder of Becket), "he ought rather to have deprived of his own kingdom."

King, iii. Appendix p. 1119-1132. Wright, "History of Ireland," vol. i. p. 178. The authenticity of Adrian's Bull is admitted in the Roman Pontiff's reply to this memorial. King, Appendix iii. pp. 1135-1139. *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal*, March 1846, pp. 329-331. Leland, i. pp. 6-10. See the references in Gieseler, "Ecclesiastical History," vol. ii. p. 197, Note 19, Fourth edition. Edinburgh: Clark, 1848.

precatory in respect of God's forgiveness, and declaratory in respect of Church censure, as I have always heard. There is nothing in either Bible or Prayer Book about "acceptance," which is a theological term of quite recent introduction. And there is nothing in the Prayer Book about a penitent, sick or whole, satisfying a minister that he is in a fit state to be absolved, or to be assured of anything personal. The priest may not withhold absolution, no matter how doubtful he may be of a penitent's sincerity.

This matter is important, because the satisfying of a clergyman as to a man's state contains the embryo of what is a worse thing than confession on the Romish system, that is *direction*. In this, which is really an outcome and development of auricular confession, the Romish clergy are great adepts. But the thing itself is not a part of what I may call the Romish constitution. To a very great extent, confession has become—perhaps it was always, pretty generally—a mere ministerial and perfunctory office. Direction never is so. The only things that can prevent Protestant direction from being as noxious as Romish, are, first, that no Protestants are educated for the art, and, second, the Protestant clergy are generally married.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

May 12th, 1888.

"B." ASSAULTS! DR. LITLEDALE.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words in answer to "B.'s" attacks on me? By "attacks" I mean only arguments. All personalities, after Hooker's example, I pass over. "Forged quotations," "poisoned weapons," "not honestly," "impenitent forger," "false witness," "without shame"—all these are pure Billingsgate, which any one may hear the like of in the fish market. I pass them all over, and come to assertions which it seems must stand for arguments. They are three: defence of Dr. Littledale, denial of what I said about *Catholic Press*, and distinction between phantasm and accidents. I will take them in order.

1. Dr. Littledale. "B." says "his," that is my "attempt to show, etc., is as utter a misrepresentation as if he used new forgeries to maintain his imputation." Now Dr. Littledale's object was to show that Rome has changed. For this purpose he tells us, p. 9, "whereas they formerly taught that only mere phantasms of bread and wine survive after consecration, now the received teaching is . . . that all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist remain as they were before." I say these two positions, old and new, are the same. What Dr. Littledale calls "phantasms," Dr. James Butler's Catechism, sanctioned by the four Archbishops, and printed by J. Duffy & Sons, Dublin, calls "accidents, taste, colour and forms of bread and wine," see p. 47. "B." says a phantasm is something that appears only to the imagination. If so, it is not what the Church of Rome says remains. What remains, she says, are the accidents; so that what Dr. Littledale calls phantasms, she herself says are accidents. I repeat, then, what I said of Dr. Littledale; that he misrepresents Roman teaching as if it had changed, whereas it remains the same; and also that he misrepresents our Black Rubric, as if it said that the accidents alone of bread and wine remain, whereas it says that the

very substances of bread and wine remain unchanged. Having done with Dr. Littledale, I now turn to what

2. The *Catholic Press* says of Dr. Littledale's attempted *eirenicon* between the two Churches. I quote from March 3rd, 1888, "Dr. Littledale's treatment of . . . Transubstantiation. . . is too good to be omitted here." Then he gives the paragraph, about twenty lines from Dr. Littledale, without word of comment, as if its absurdity was palpable to all: and goes on contradicting directly the romance about the Black Rubric. I said Dr. Littledale stretched out the right-hand of fellowship—so he did, if trying to prove that the two Churches hold the same, may be so styled. "B." calls this right hand "a buffet," but so the *Catholic Press* did not understand it. Whether the editor is "a vulgar ignorant person," as "B." says, he was well able to return with scorn the hand stretched out to him. If what Dr. Littledale evidently meant as a friendly hand, ought to be looked on as a "buffet," I must leave to Dr. Littledale himself. It seems to have been ill-taken at any rate.

3. I now come to phantasm and accidents. These two things, "B." says, have nothing in common; and "phantasm is something that appears only to the imagination." If so, "B." is wrong in calling what remains of bread after consecration "phantasm," for Rome in Butler's Catechism, calls them accidents, and 2 and 3 Canons of Trent calls them "species of bread and wine." When I thought that "B." was calling accidents phantasms, I asked for the difference between the two. But now that he says that phantasm is only what appears to the imagination, then I agree with him that phantasm and what Rome calls accidents or species, have nothing at all in common.

4. Whether I have shown that Dr. Littledale made overtures to Rome or not, that for this purpose he misrepresented both her and us, making her and our Black Rubric speak "equivalent language"; whether or not the *Catholic Press* scorned this embrace which "B." calls a "buffet"; whether or not Rome did, and does call what remains of the elements perceptible to our senses, the accidents, though "B." says they "appear only to the imagination," and therefore have nothing in common with the accidents, as Rome styles what remains; whether I have or have not made good all these points, I must now leave to your readers, and so bid farewell to my courteous opponent "B."

AN AFFLICTED RELATIVE.

Reviews and Notices.

"ST. JOHN THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL."

By Howard Heber Evans, B.A. London: Nisbet & Co., 1888. Pp. 132.

MR. EVANS has this time adopted a theme in which he will find plenty of scholars to agree with his conclusion, whatever they may think of some of his premises. He has found *one* scholar of eminence to say of his attempt to credit St. Paul with the last twelve verses of the second Gospel, "You have, I think, made out a fairly strong case"; and that scholar is noted for his perverse ingenuity in making what he fancies to be "fairly strong cases" out of infinitesimal specks of evidence. He has not found one scholar to say that he has made out any case at all for crediting St. Paul with the Acts and the Third Gospel, and we

venture confidently to predict that he never will. We have no intention of arguing the point, but we venture to enter a protest against the language which he uses in a letter in the PULPIT of May 12th. "The Gentile Luke could no more have composed the Hebraistic Acts of the Apostles, than Victor Hugo could have written *In Memoriam*. It is utterly impossible, and it is high time that this *simple and obvious fact* were thoroughly recognised." In other words, all scholars, from Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria down to Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Salmon, who have believed in St. Luke's authorship, have been ignorant and incompetent critics, for they have utterly failed to see a "*simple and obvious fact*." It has been reserved for Mr. Heber Evans to set Christendom right on this point.

It is quite in the same spirit that he assures us in the present volume, in large capital letters, that "it is a psychological impossibility that the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel could have been other than the work of one and the same mind." In other words, all the scholars from Dionysius of Alexandria down to the present day who, whether they accepted the common authorship or not, have admitted that there is serious difficulty in attributing both books to St. John, have been bunglers. If they had only been as clear-sighted as Mr. Evans, they would have seen that, so far from there being any difficulty, no other hypothesis is even possible. This is not the tone which trustworthy guides adopt.

The book consists almost entirely of quotations, and of quotations from modern authors whose works are very accessible. Nevertheless, some people will be glad to have these quotations from Westcott, Farrar, Liddon, Trench, Alford, etc., etc., picked out for them and classified. They show that there are plenty of competent scholars who believe, and believe with good reason, that St. John wrote the Apocalypse, and that St. John wrote the Fourth Gospel. For those who accept their reasons and their authority, the case is then concluded; St. John wrote both books: and the process of argument shows that, if there are remarkable differences between the two books, there are also remarkable similarities.

The most valuable portion of the quotations, so far as the main thesis is concerned, are those placed in the last chapter to show the probability that the last surviving Apostle would write a Gospel, and the improbability that the Fourth Gospel would ever have been accepted by the Church, if it had not been Apostolic. This last argument admits of being stated in a more definite way. The Fourth Gospel was thoroughly acknowledged by Christians before A.D. 180. St. John died C.A.D. 100. Bisect the eighty years interval and argue thus:—If the Fourth Gospel was written *after* A.D. 140, how could it have become universally accepted by A.D. 180? If it was written *before* A.D. 140, how was it that the hundreds of Christians who had known St. John personally did not denounce it as a forgery?

There is a useful Appendix of identical or similar expressions which occur in the Gospel and in the Apocalypse; but the Greek has no accents, and this omission rather mars the look of a good piece of work.

We think it right to add a word about the *advertisements* of his other works, which Mr. Evans has placed in this volume. Of course they are not intended to do so, but they produce an entirely false impression upon the casual reader; viz., that the

notices of the books are very numerous, and that some of them are by Dr. Wace, Dr. Farrar, Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. Bruce, Archbishop Trench, Bishop Wordsworth, Dr. Hort, Prebendary Row, and others. The paragraphs which bear these honoured names are *not notices of Mr. Evans's books at all*, and ought not to be mixed up with paragraphs which *are* notices of them. Some remarks of Dr. Hayman on one book do duty for both, and thus he is made to appear as praising a portion of two works, when he praised only a portion of one. For the sake of those who rely upon first impressions these paragraphs should be rearranged, and the notices of the books should be kept separate from general remarks

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY ON THE STATE OF HIS DIOCESE.—At his visitation at Sherborne Abbey Church, on Tuesday, the 1st inst., the Bishop of Salisbury said he should speak on a subject which he had not yet referred to in other places he had visited—he meant the state of the diocese of Salisbury. He presented statistics for the year 1887, showing that there were in the diocese 530 parishes or chapelries served by 485 separate incumbents, with a staff of curates, which, including those in the cathedral, brought up the total number of clergy in the diocese to 700. But of these 530 parishes or chapelries, forty were very small places, so they might consider the number of parishes to be really 490. There were seventy-four churchyards returned as overcrowded, and unless private help was forthcoming, a stringent Act of Parliament would be necessary. He had dedicated two churchyards. The Nonconformist burials, so far as he could judge from the statistics available, were about twenty-eight. There had been no difficulty in carrying out the last Burials Act—a fact which showed that the clergy must have shown great patience and forbearance in the matter. The work of building and of restoration still went on in the diocese steadily. It is true that in 1885, 1886, and 1887, only three churches were consecrated, but there were now signs of more progress. He had recently dedicated a new church at Broadstone near Wimborne, and he looked forward to being able to report the completion of two more churches in the district between Poole and Bournemouth, and a third at Netherton. The Bishop mentioned about twelve parishes where the work of Church restoration was going forward. Touching on the question of Church restoration funds, His Lordship said that whilst a bazaar might be useful for secondary purposes in connection with church work, he thought that for building or restoring a place dedicated to the service of God, such a means of raising money was hardly suitable. He gave the following figures, explaining that they were approximate only, and that they did not include offertories at Salisbury Cathedral, nor offertories for the Church of England Temperance Society:—429 parishes make returns of offertories; 254 of these collected by the offertories for Home Missions the sum of £1,814 16s. 7d.; 388 collected by the offertories for Foreign Missions. the sum of £3,453 16s. 3d. Only 252 collected for the four diocesan societies, and they raised between them only £527. Four hundred parishes collected for hospitals the sum of £2,284 18s. 4d., making a total for all the parishes of £8,080 11s. 2d. Each of those parishes collected on an average about £18 or £19 a year, beyond what it required for its own church expenses and for its own sick and poor.

The money for the hospitals was distributed between thirty institutions, amongst these being the hospitals of Bournemouth, Bath and Frome. He asked the clergy present to make a special collection before Trinity Sunday on behalf of the Diocesan Societies. He commended the printing and publication of parochial accounts and the assistance of the churchwardens in collecting and disbursing all offertories, including those taken at the office of Communion. He disclaimed the first position among the dioceses of England given by the *Ecclesiastical Gazette* in a recent number to the diocese of Salisbury, in the matter of the number of persons confirmed per annum on a ten years' calculation. He pointed out a flaw in the computation, but showed that on a twelve years' basis the average annual number had been as high as 4,522. He urged the clergy to take up the temperance question, and said they had now 128 coffee taverns, 188 reading rooms, and 229 lending libraries. He regretted that the Church of England Temperance Society showed a decline in the number of its branches. As to week-day services, 130 churches had been alive to their duties in this respect. He thought on that point an example was set by the Wesleyans that churchmen ought not to be ashamed to follow. Where possible, the members of a surpliced choir should be communicants. Female voices should be introduced into the church-singing. They might be accommodated in the Western gallery, which was a capital place—he had it on high musical authority—for singing to be heard to advantage. He hoped the mania for pulling down Western galleries would not spread. Taking the English Church generally, he thought the number of communicants was only about 10 per cent. of the congregations. How to increase the proportion might well form a subject of discussion at ruri-decanal conferences. It was a pity parents did not encourage their children to take the Sacrament. Touching the education of children, it would not be a bad plan to teach them to repeat a collect to themselves whenever they heard church bells, whether they were in the fields or wherever they were.

SELWYN COLLEGE, Cambridge, will be used during part of August and September for a course of residence and instruction for licensed readers. The Principal will be Canon Whitaker, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Wakefield. Mr. E. A. Ford, 2, Eldon Road, Hampstead, is hon. secretary and treasurer to the London Diocesan Readers' Training Committee.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Argles, Rev. George M., M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Bishop-hill, York; Canon of Riccall, in York Minster.
Austen, Rev. George, M.A., Rector of Whithy; Canon of Knaresborough, in York Minster.

Brodrick, Hon. and Rev. Canon A., Rector of Alverstoke Rural Dean of Alverstoke.
Bromby the Right Rev. Dr., formerly Bishop of Tasmania; Rector of Edgmond, Shropshire.
Corfe, Rev. C. J., Chaplain to Portsmouth Dockyard.
Cross, Rev. G. F. B., Vicar of St. Peter's, Great Windmill Street.
Deane, Rev. Charles, D.C.L., Vicar of St. Faith's, Maidstone.
Downes, Rev. A. N., Vicar of Batheaston-cum-St. Catherine's, Somersetshire.
Dyson, Rev. Frank, M.A., Principal of the Liverpool College; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Edgworth, Rev. Roger, Rector of Hooke, Dorset.
Elstob, Rev. J. G., M.A., Priest-Vicar of Chichester Cathedral; Perpetual Curate of Capethorne-with-Siddington, Chelford, Cheshire.
English, Rev. W. W., D.D., Sole Charge of West Drayton, Middlesex.
Ford, Rev. William Henry, Vicar of New Buckenham, Norfolk; Vicar of Moniasb, Bakewell.
Goodwyn, Rev. F. M., Vicar of Sharrow, Sheffield; Canon of Stillington, in York Minster.
Hamilton, Rev. Charles Chetwode, M.A., Vicar of Fillongley Warwickshire; Vicar of Tettenhall.
Hawes, Rev. Langdon, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Sheerness; Vicar of Bredhurst, Kent.
Helliier, Rev. W. L., Curate of St. John's, Exeter; Vicar of St. Luke's, Sheffield.
Hullah, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Rector of Calstock; Honorary Canon of St. Coventin, in Truro Cathedral.
Leach, Rev. J. W., Rector of Chelvey; Rector of Brockley, Somerset.
Lee, Rev. J. F. V., Curate of Berkeley; Rector of Cranford, Middlesex.
Light, Rev. J. H., Senior Curate of Abingdon; Vicar of Lambourne, Berks.
Maddrell, Rev. T. F., M.A., Priest-Vicar and Sacrist in Truro Cathedral.
Pacard, Rev. Osborn Burgess, M.A., Rector of Depden, Suffolk; Vicar of Dullingham.
Perry, Rev. Andrew, Vicar of Feock; Vicar of Gwinear, Cornwall.
Samwell, Rev. Arthur M., Curate of Rothwell, Leeds; Incumbent of Marton, Cheshire.
Simms, Rev. Arthur Hennell, Vicar of Churchstow-with-Kingsbridge; Rector of Wolborough, Newton Abbot.
Spalding, Rev. A. C. C., Vicar of All Saints', Preston, near Cirencester.
Stable, Rev. Samuel Montague, B.A., Vicar of Newton-on-Trent, Lincolnshire.
Stocks, Rev. Philip, Vicar of Great Bowden, near Market Harborough, Leicestershire; Vicar of Ketton, near Stamford, Rutland.
Strange, Rev. Cresswell, Vicar of Edgbaston; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Warwickshire.
Warre, Rev. Francis, M.A., Rural Dean Bradford Portion of the Potterne Rural Deanery.
Woosnam, Rev. C. M., Vicar of St. Peter's, North Shields; Rector of Kirkby Wiske with Maunby Thirsk.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Alexander, Rev. Charles Leslie, Rector of Stanton-by-Bridge-cum-Swarkstone, Derbyshire, at the Rectory, Stanton-by-Bridge, on the 13th inst., aged 68.
Anderson, Rev. Samuel Ruthven, Vicar of Otley and Rural Dean, at Harrogate, on the 12th inst., aged 59.
Claydon, Rev. E. A., M.A., at Luton Rectory, Chatham, on the 9th inst., aged 61.
Giles, Rev. Charles William, D.D., at Milton Hall, near Cambridge, on the 12th inst., aged 65.
Leachman, Rev. Edmund, Vicar of the parish, at Chrishall Vicarage, on the 11th inst., aged 63.
Nowes, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Vicar of Ketton-cum-Tixover, at 9, Royal Crescent, on the 27th ult., aged 64.
Stammers, Rev. Robert, for fifty-six years Vicar of Quorndon, on the 7th inst., aged 85.
Tracy, Rev. Frederick Francis, M.A., Chr. Coll. of St. Barnabas, Cambridge, sometime Rector of Beccles, and Vicar of Rushem, Isle of Man, at Cambridge, on the 11th inst., aged 59.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE BODY IN THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

BY THE REV. DR. PAGET.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, ON APRIL 22ND, 1888.

“Glorify God in your body.”—1 COR. vi. 20.

IN this brief command St. Paul sums up the practical outcome of the argument with which he has been occupied. These few words will stick in men’s memories; they may tell on thought and action at innumerable points; they fix the true aim in a task that has got miserably tangled and perplexed. And so St. Paul ends with them this division of his letter: for it seems evident that the words which follow them in our version did not form part of the original text.

I. “Glorify God in your body.” The demand is closely linked with the thoughts of the foregoing verses: and though it clearly reaches far beyond the subject with which they are especially concerned, it is in them that we must learn the depth and intensity of its meaning. For it is the positive rule involved in those great truths with which St. Paul has been meeting the sophistry used by some to palliate a most degrading sin. It is not necessary for us to examine in detail their arguments, or their bold misuse of St. Paul’s own language. It is enough, at present, to follow him as he drags to light the fundamental and fatal error of their position. That error was a shamefully inadequate idea of the human body; of its meaning, and purpose, and capacity. Men who talked as they did, must, plainly and avowedly, be thinking of the body as incapable of anything above the level, or beyond the limits of this world: as adapted to find its full occupation and satisfaction among the things of sense: as having neither use, nor hope, nor fellowship in any higher life: as sensitive to no transforming power from above. In their estimate the body itself was of no more importance than its transient desires and processes of nourishment during this short stage in this development. They thought that its career lay wholly between birth and death; and that the only forces to which it could answer were the ordinary conditions of animal existence: and, with the ruinous confidence of moral shortsightedness, they made up a corresponding theory as to its proper treatment and occupation. The

Vol. XXV.—No. 648.

beginning and the end of the body, they said, all its life and use and receptivity, is here, is sensuous: and so they saw nothing terrible in taking it and imprisoning it here; in surrendering it wholly to earthliness: in shutting out all voices and all light that might have reached it from above, and deeming that in silence and in darkness it might find the fulfilment of its purpose; since it was only meant to grovel and enjoy itself, after the fashion of its kindred, with the beasts that perish. So they seemed to think who, in the congenial air of Corinth, were constructing a system of Christian Ethics, in which sins of impurity should be treated as matters of indifference. And it is against the hopeless and fatal tyranny of such insolent ignorance that St. Paul displays the truth, in all its liberating strength; the truth which determines the bearing of Christianity on the life of the body. There are, indeed, more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in that philosophy of complacent self-degrading. “The body is not for fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body.” Decisively, abruptly, universally, all is changed when that is seen. No contrast could be more absolute or more transforming. At once the full light of Easter flashes out upon the gross darkness of the guilty conscience, blinded and stupefied by the lie that it has begun to love. “The body is for the Lord, and the Lord for the body”: in the risen Humanity of the Incarnate Son, complete and spiritual, is revealed its ultimate purpose. Through whatever processes of preparation and development it has reached its present condition, yet greater changes lie before it: the meaning of its union with a living Spirit, a Spirit that can know God, is not yet disclosed. “For Christ will change the body of our humiliation so that it shall be conformable to the Body of His Glory.” Not, then, for a mere transient purpose of discipline or probation, and far less for a ministry of sensual gratification, do we find ourselves in this world so mysteriously, so inextricably, united with a material frame: there is a deep and wonderful prophecy in that inscrutable interaction of soul and body which may sometimes startle, or bewilder, or distress us: it hints at the hope of the body, the opportunity of the soul; it means that the body also is accessible to the divine life—that there are avenues by which the power of the Resurrection can invade it—that it is capable of a transfiguration—that for it, too, the Lord from heaven is a quickening Spirit. And on that belief rests first of all an astounding hope. For, as St. Paul continues—“God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by His own power.” The Holy Sepulchre was empty upon Easter day: the Body which the Word of God had taken in the Virgin’s womb had passed on into a new sphere and manner of being; through suffering and death it had been brought to perfection; by a change which could

not be otherwise than inscrutable to us, it had become a spiritual Body, wholly penetrated and transformed by the unhindered Glory of God. And thus, in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ had been made known the transforming power that can bring a human body to the state for which the Love of God has fashioned and prepared it. And, surely, even if this were all, if men only knew that a frame like their own had been so dealt with, and that the hope of such a change was set before them also, the knowledge might make them reverent and expectant and watchful in the ordering of the bodily life: they could not dare to dishonour or enslave that in whose likeness so great a glory had been once revealed, that for which so transcendent a destiny might be in store.

II. But this is very far from being all. There is something else to be remembered in this matter, which is yet more quickening and controlling than the most splendid hope could be. For St. Paul goes on to appeal to two well-known axioms of the Church's teaching, as amplifying and bringing right into the heart of daily life the truth which must dispel the sophistry of his Corinthian antagonist. He need not dwell upon these axioms: he need only just recall them: for they are the primary and characteristic notes of Christian faith and life; they are absolutely essential to the reasonableness of its initial ceremony, and of all its highest acts; so that if they are forgotten or denied, Christianity loses its hold on life, and recedes into the distance, impoverished and dwindling into a mere matter for speculative or poetic treatment. They are the closely united truths of the present fellowship of Christians with the risen Humanity of Christ, and of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. "Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?" "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost Which is in you?" These are the present facts in which the higher possibility, the spiritual calling of the body, is made known. Even now, Christ leaves not Himself without witness in its life. Even here it may receive the presence, it may yield to the power, of the Spirit by Whom it shall be raised, incorruptible and wholly spiritual, at the last day. There is a continuity, howsoever it may be hindered or threatened, in the perfecting of a human nature. It is wrought by the same agent and the same instrument from the beginning to the endless end; from the first stirring of the Holy Spirit's influence to the day when spirit, soul, and body are presented blameless before the throne of God. The change begins on earth: already the body is for the Lord: to be uplifted by His power, informed by His Spirit, possessed and realised in His service: and already the Lord is for the body: in His glory He abideth not alone: He rose again for us: His risen and ascended Manhood, taken wholly in the conditions of spiritual existence, is now the unfettered organ of His eternal life, the free and all-sufficing means whereby "He visiteth

the earth and blesseth it"—whereby remaining in Himself, He maketh all things new, and in all ages entering into holy souls, maketh them friends, aye, and children, of God. "He rose again for our justification." He has, as one has said, "elevated His material nature to be for evermore the instrument of spiritual action:" His risen Body, free and unhindered now at the disposal of the Spirit, is "a real centre of energy for the transformation of our lives."*

And it is an energy which, issuing from His complete and perfect Manhood, is borne by the indwelling Spirit to every part of our human nature; here and now beginning that which may hereafter be fulfilled and known—here and now making strange things possible, even in the body of our humiliation: hinting at changes which can but be begun on earth: achieving in some the earnest of the future victory; interrupting all that we call natural with the fragments of the true nature that as yet we know but dimly and in part: disturbing any narrow and premature completeness with unaccountable traits of "somewhat above capacity of reason, somewhat divine and heavenly, which reason with hidden exultation, rather surmiseth than conceiveth;" and sending

Through all this fleshly dress,
Bright shoots of everlastingness. †

Not only is the body for the Lord hereafter: hereafter to be raised to that perfection whither He through suffering has passed before: but here, also, and already it may be reached, and touched, and cleansed, and quickened, by the mysterious energy of His Manhood: it may own the brightness and the dominion of His presence—as the Holy Spirit dwelling in it reveals its unsuspected capacity of life and freedom, and raises it into closer union with its risen Lord.

III. Such is, in part, the import of those truths with which St. Paul rebukes the Corinthian apologist for sensuality. He could appeal to them as certain to be in the front of every Christian's mind; as secure of an immediate recognition by any one who bore Christ's name. Must we not own that—quite apart from anything which is ordinarily called loss of faith—they do not now hold the place which He demands and presumes for them in Christian thought? That our very bodies may be affected by a real energy from the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ and the communication of His risen Manhood: that the power of His Resurrection may extend to the physical conditions of our life: that very slowly and partially, it may be, with limits that are soon reached, and hindrances that will not yield, yet, for all that, very truly and practically, the redemption of our body may be begun on earth: surely these thoughts are stranger to many

* Cf. Father Benson, "The Life beyond the Grave," pp. 23, 649. Dr. Milligan, "The Resurrection of our Lord," pp. 24, 129.

† Henry Vaughan, "Silex Scintillans," p. 34.

of us than they clearly were to St. Paul and his converts; stranger than they should be: stranger than they have been to many who were far removed from mysticism, and incapable of unreality. For instance, few of us, I venture to think, are quite ready for such words as these of Hooker's:—"Doth any man doubt but that from the flesh of Christ our very bodies do receive that life which shall make them glorious at the latter day, and for which they are already accounted parts of His blessed Body? Our corruptible bodies could never live the life they shall live, were it not that here they are joined with His Body, which is incorruptible, and that His is in ours as a cause of immortality, a cause by removing through the death and merit of His own flesh that which hindered the life of ours."* I would not try to speak, for I have neither time nor insight, of the hopes which seem to be astir in words and thoughts like these. But I would suggest, brethren, that we should in careful reverence and humility, be trying to know more and more of the power of the resurrection in the life of the body. And there are many ways in which we may be watching for its tokens, and learning its reality. In the lives of the Saints, in their clearness and freedom, their successful resolution not to be brought under the power of the things which domineer over most men; their calmness in tumult, their steadiness of judgment through fatigue and suffering, their thankfulness in all things, their self-possession in the face of death. Or again, in some few careers which have in our own day arrested and controlled men's thoughts by their strange impressiveness—careers in which the intensity of spiritual force appeared in a power of endurance, or of command, which common opinion instinctively called supernatural: careers such as those of Hannington or Gordon—men born and nurtured in conditions like our own, and yet so splendidly unhindered by the things which keep us back. Or we may turn to the history of ethics, and we are told that "It is a simple historical fact that, among all nations and in all ages, belief in Christ alone has fought and mastered the sins of the flesh."† We must own, indeed, with bitter shame, the hideous disfigurement that has prevailed, that still prevails, in nations nominally His: but still there has been a change clear and steady enough to demand attention and explanation: the power of His Resurrection has conquered, and is conquering day by day, passions which made havoc almost unchecked until Christ came. And then surely, in the history of art, we find a remarkable acknowledgment, conscious or unconscious, that a transforming power has told upon the visible world, so as to change man's estimate of art's highest theme. Was

it not the intense, surpassing interest of those traits, and lines, and looks in which the work of the Spirit was seen in human faces—faces wasted, it may be, and harassed by the very greatness of the life that was astir, yet wrought even by their pain to a beauty which made all mere physical perfection seem thenceforward cold, and poor, and dead—was it not this that drew the artist's gaze away from that which had seemed highest upon earth, to watch for the disclosure of that which was least in the Kingdom of Heaven;—that he might "bring the invisible full into play"*—that he might paint so that men should have fresh knowledge of the hidden work of God? And so, brethren, I would venture very tentatively to speak of one more way in which, I think, we might be learning something of the real power of the Holy Spirit in the life of the body. Surely we might trace it sometimes in the faces and in the voices of those who, in penitence and prayer and love, with suffering or long self-discipline, have yielded up their wills, their lives, to Him—have truly longed that He should have His way with them. The thought is beautifully told in a well-known book on the resurrection of our Lord.† But I cannot help citing a curious and merely incidental expression of it from a very different source. One of the cleverest of modern novels has for its central character a young American artist—Roderick Hudson—brilliant, unprincipled, conceited. He has been living a wholly selfish life in Rome for some time, when his mother and her adopted daughter, Mary Garland, come from America to visit him. And the first time he sees them—simple, pious, loving folk, who have been living in constant anxiety for his sake—he turns suddenly to his mother, in the middle of a sentence, and asks abruptly, "What makes you look so odd?—What has happened to your face these two years? It has changed its expression." "Your mother has prayed a great deal," said Mary, simply. "Well, it makes a very good face," answers Roderick, "very interesting, very solemn—it has very fine lines in it."‡ Yes, brethren, there are many faces about this world, I think, in which prayer, and patience, and humility, have, by God's grace, wrought a beauty which may be the nearest approach that can be seen in this world to the glory of the resurrection: the glory that is to be revealed in those who shall then be wholly penetrated and transfigured by the Spirit of the Lord.

IV. Such may seem to be some of the ways in which we may mark the real power of the resurrection in the life of the body. But after all, by far the best, the surest, the happiest verification of St. Paul's great claim must be made by each man for himself, in the effort of obedience to the bidding

* Hooker, V. lvi. 9.

† Mr. Wilson, cited by Mr. R. L. Ottley—"The Discipline of Self," p. 22.

* Mr. Browning's "Old Pictures at Florence."

† Dr. Milligan, pp. 21, 190.

‡ "Roderick Hudson," by Mr. Henry James; vol. ii.

of the text, in the hidden discipline of life, through pain and toil and fear, it may be, yet by the grace of God, not without some earnest of a victory whose faintest, briefest forecast is better than all the pleasures of compromise—the victory of self-possession for the glory of God. It is pitiful to imagine how much of strength and liberty and joy is being missed or marred day after day by the mistakes men make in dealing with their bodies. I am not thinking now at all of the misery and havoc wrought by sheer misuse; by gluttony, and drunkenness, and lust. Quite apart and utterly different from sins like these, there are misunderstandings of the body's meaning, and limited, one-sided ways of treating it, which, with little or no blame perhaps, still hinder grievously the worth and happiness that life might have, and that the Love of God intended for it. There are the two mistakes that Plato has for ever characterised in the Third Book of the Republic; there is the mistake of a narrow and exclusive athleticism, in which excellent means are just spoilt by the lack of an adequate end; and there is the far more serious, expensive, and persistent blunder of the valetudinarian; the exacting worship of a thankless idol, which would probably fare much better if the rich man, like the artisan, had no time to be ill, and thought it not worth while to live *νοσήματι τὸν νοδὸν προσέχοντα, τῆς δὲ προκειμένης ἐργασίας ἀμελοῦντα*.*

But must we not own that there is also, in much Christian thought and teaching, I would not say a mistake, but an omission, which has involved some serious loss? On every ground it is right that the lesson of the Cross should come first and stand ever foremost in the discipline of the Christian life; but is there not room and need also for the lesson of the Resurrection? Probably we all of us know well enough why the note of Lent should be ever clear and strong in our lives; but should not the note of Easter, too, be constant; the note of thankful welcome for that stream of life, and light and health which issues from a fount that our sins can never sully, that our prayers and penitence may always reach? We need not be one whit less firm and watchful in self-discipline, less mindful of the war we wage, because we lift our hearts in wondering joy to greet the strength that is made perfect in our weakness; the Presence that can preserve both body and soul unto life everlasting.

Suffer me to put into another form what I am trying to express. On Thursday last, I was standing on the hill between Cumnor and North Hinksey, and delighting in one of those effects of contrast which seem the peculiar glory of an April sky. Over all the west and north there loomed an angry storm; black, and wild, and ominous, with here and there a lurid tinge, it spread from Faringdon almost to Godstow. But, constantly, against that sullen mass, the larks were rising into the

fresh air, as though they were resolute that no threats or fears should stay their song of praise for spring; and when one turned towards the east, the clouds were light and few, and the distant hills were clear; and the white Cross, near Bledlow, was gleaming in the sun. May there not be something like that contrast in the inner life? Something like that voice of joy even in the face of all that is so dark and threatening; ever some steadiness of light about the east; ever some radiance of the Resurrection falling on the Cross, the Cross of shame, and suffering, and conquest? Certainly, when men were most of all in earnest about self-discipline, the joy of the Risen Life was not weak or uncertain in them. Let us recall some words which may have a peculiar force for us to-day; since he who wrote them has been taken from among us:—"Mediaeval Christianity is reproached with its gloom and austerities; it assigns the material world, says Heine, to the devil. But yet what a fulness of delight does St. Francis manage to draw from this material world itself and from its commonest and most universally enjoyed elements—sun, air, earth, water, plants. His hymn expresses a far more cordial sense of happiness, even in the material world, than the hymn of Theocritus. It is this which made the fortune of Christianity—its gladness, not its sorrow; not its assigning the spiritual world to Christ, and the material world to the devil, but its drawing from the spiritual world a source of joy so abundant that it ran over upon the material world and transfigured it."*

V. Many, perhaps, will recognise whose words those are. In Oxford to-day even one who had not the distinction and delight of Mr. Matthew Arnold's friendship may be allowed to speak of him, and may be pardoned, I trust, if he speaks unworthily; since it was difficult to be silent. Mr. Arnold has, beyond dispute, enriched the life of our day with such true help as always comes from perfect workmanship. To him we owe the highest standard and example of excellence in the critic's work; and this alone were no indifferent gift; for there would be far more reverence and simplicity and charity among men, if criticism always were as he would have it be, "A disinterested endeavour to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world." To him we owe the disclosure of a beauty in our language such as only two or three, perhaps at most, beside him in this age have attained. And this again is far more than a mere adornment of human life. A deeper debt is due to those who so advance the ideal of expression; for many hard, and foolish, and untrue things, might be left unsaid if men would only wait till they could say them in good English. Thankfully, too, let us recall how much his delicate and eager sense of beauty and his faultless happiness of utterance, have added to the pure gladness and refreshment

* Plato "Rep.", 406, D.; Cf. Dörner's "Christian Ethics."

* "Essays in Criticism," p. 207.

men may find in nature. Surely, it is a triumph of poetic power and beneficence to have linked for ever with our Oxford scenery thoughts almost as exquisite and high as those which Wordsworth found among his nobler hills and vales.

But yet we owe to Mr. Arnold even greater debts than these. I should fail, brethren, in the sincerity due alike to his memory and to the trust I hold, if I were to shrink from saying of certain parts of his work that I believe they make way, however utterly against his earnest wish, for the impoverishment of human life and for the darkening of divine light. But there are great truths which it was granted him to bear into the mind of his day with a power and purity perhaps unique. The meanness and vulgarity of self-centredness, the absurdity of self-advertisement, the ludicrous littleness of unreality; it is worth while to have had these things made quite clear and vivid to us by a master's hand. But as a poet he has done far more for us than this. With a power of buoyancy which would have made it easy to disguise, or even to forget at times, all grief, he never has kept back from us the sorrow that had come to stay where faith had been—the sorrow which is perhaps the noblest witness that a doubting mind and a pure heart can bear to truth. And he has told—as none, I think, has told save he—the depth and solitude and greatness of the buried life; “the mystery of this heart which beats so wild, so deep, in us.” And, above all, with his loyal abhorrence of all acquiescence in any poor and stunted thoughts of life, he has never failed to bid us one and all to live with undivided care, with absolute allegiance, by the very highest hope that our hearts descry. There is light and help for all in teaching such as this: and he whose pure and gracious skill has borne it into many souls has earned indeed our reverent and prayerful gratitude.

CHILDREN'S SERMON.

NOTES SUITABLE TO FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

“God is Love.”—1 St. JOHN iv. 16.

CHILDREN, do you love your parents? Yes. Why? Because (a) They are my parents; (b) They take care of me and do everything for me; and (c) Because they love me.

Dear Children, God (a) is your father in Heaven. (b) He does take care of you and He does love you. Look out in your Bibles, (a) Ps. lxxviii. 5; (b) 1 Peter v. 7; (c) 1 St. John iv. 19. You see He is just like an earthly parent in His love; you can take all your troubles to Him and leave them with Him. Would you not do anything in your power for earthly parents? Yes. Why? To show my *affection* and *gratitude*. God, our dear

Father in Heaven, is so loving to us, what must we do to show our *affection* and *gratitude* to Him. At least four things, which we may remember by the word LOVE. God is love, and so we must be.

I. Loving. (a) To Him; *i.e.*, learn to know Him more as a father, and ask him for whatever we need. Read His letter to us often. Speak to Him often (prayer). (b) To others; *i.e.*, be gentle and kind to our fellow creatures, and look upon them as brothers and sisters.

II. Obedient. Do whatever He tells you. How do I know what to do? Look at the directions He has given us in His letter, especially in Ex. xx.

III. Valiant. If you were to hear any one speak against your father or mother you would be indignant, so you should be when you hear any one dishonouring your Father in Heaven.

IV. Eager. What for. 1. To do all He tells you. 2. To know Him better. 3. To love Him more. 4. To speak about Him. 5. To see Him and be with Him.

LOVE.

“Little children, love each other.”

’Tis our blessed Master’s rule;

Every little one is brother

To his playfellows at school.

We’re all children of one Father,

That great God who reigns above;

Shall we quarrel? No; much rather

Would we dwell like Him, in love.

He has placed us here together,

That we may be good and kind,

He is ever watching whether

We are one in heart and mind.

Who is stronger than the other;

Let him be the weak one’s friend;

Who’s more playthings than his brother;

He should like to give or lend.

All they have they share with others,

With kind looks and gentle words,

Thus they live like happy brothers.

And are known to be the Lord’s.

MR. JAMES BROOKS has been appointed hon. architect to the Canterbury Diocesan Board of Education.

THE Bishop of North Queensland has arrived in England. His address is Bank House, Monmouth Road, Bayswater.

ARCHDEACON ILES having been prevented by illness from holding his usual Visitation, his place has been taken by the Bishop of the diocese, the Dean of Lichfield, and the Bishop of Shrewsbury, who have delivered addresses.

WE regret to hear that the Bishop of Southwell is suffering from an attack of pleurisy, the result of a severe chill caught during his Visitations in Derbyshire. The Bishop of Nottingham has kindly undertaken to hold his Trinity ordination for him at St. Mary’s Church, Nottingham, and Canon Were will act as his Commissary for ordinary business for the present.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
 FOR
RHEUMATISM

Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"The Electropathic belt has completely cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."

Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application to Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, the Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**

Only Address, 52, OXFORD ST., LONDON, W.
 (Corner of Rathbone Place.)
 Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 26, 1888.

THE "PULPIT."

THIS week our readers will notice statements which give promise of a new stage in the history of our paper. Of the cheap periodicals already in existence, some are decidedly mischievous, and most others confine themselves to the supply of mere secular knowledge. We are far from regretting that literature and science are brought to the door of our countrymen, but we have felt, as Christians, the deficiency of this world's wisdom, we have felt that religious men ought to use the same instruments which scientific men are using, and carry sound Scripture truth through the length and breadth of the land. This is our sphere. We wish to place in the hands of Christian Britain a periodical within every man's means, which shall steadily maintain the distinguishing doctrine of the Gospel. If it be inquired, as at such a time might be expected, what are the particular principles we maintain, we reply, we are English Churchmen. No bitterness against the professors of the Roman Catholic faith shall be permitted in our pages, but we shall in the most uncompromising way contend against popery—the corrupted system which has withheld from the people the Word of God. and has substituted for it the traditions of men; which is now struggling to regain in this land its lost supremacy—we repeat, we are Churchmen, though not intolerant ones. We will not unchristianise the dissenting bodies which have grown up amongst us, but we shall firmly advocate the doctrine and discipline of our Church. Whilst we are careful not to launch upon the troubled sea of politics, we shall sedulously watch the occurrence of events which

may influence the progress of the Gospel in the world. Our attention will often, too, be directed to the state of religion in Ireland and Scotland, and being zealously anxious that the earth should "be filled with the knowledge of the Lord," we are naturally warm friends to Missionary enterprise. In fact, we believe a missionary spirit to be an essential part of the spirit of Christianity. We wish it to be understood that an essay on some religious subject, and at least one sermon will continue to appear in every number of our periodical. To the last mentioned we call particular attention, because we think that this part of our work will be of peculiar value to those who are wholly or partially kept by some insurmountable obstacle from attendance on public worship, and subscribers will thus have the opportunity of continuing to read the pulpit addresses of many of the most distinguished and devoted clergymen of the day, whose future help we hope to secure, and for whose past contributions we gladly take this opportunity of thanking them. We trust that in our pages, as well as in the Church, God's Word will not be permitted to return unto Him void. We have now, we trust, explained in an intelligible manner the principles and plans of our publication; and if at any time deficiency or error be detected in our labours, let not our readers throw us hastily aside. We ask their patience, we ask their prayers for us, that we may be endued with that wisdom from on High, without which our best endeavours can be of little value, and knowing that the Lord often uses very feeble instruments to accomplish His mightiest designs, we commend our work to His blessing, with the hope that in the sphere which He opens before us, our periodical will carry to very many hearts "a word in season."

EDITOR.

IS AN IRISH SCHISM A RIDICULOUS BOGEY?

LOOKING for a decision or a step towards a decision on this question, to experience and to the facts already developed, what appears? Where did the great Reformation Schism, as some term it, originate and how speed? In Germany it turned on a question of conscience and cash, and brought to light the long corrupted doctrine of justification by faith in the only merits of a Saviour. In England it turned on a question of National Independence *plus* cash and conscience, and the result was the assertion of the Royal Supremacy *versus* the Roman, with all the rest in the Thirty-nine Articles and Book of Common Prayer. In Switzerland it turned on the question of individual independence, and brought out the result of John Calvin's system laid down on the lines of municipal election and popular rights. This is also the Scottish Presbyterianism,

which exactly fitted the independent spirit of these two rugged and isolated races in their mountain fastnesses, and among the Baillies of their manly corporate aggregations. They who read the current news may find no insignificant amount of contributions towards the solution of the question under debate. Is there not here a nationality, or what for this is the same, a quasi-nationality item.—a financial question with the Church itself—a case of cash and conscience *ab extra*—a rugged spirit of independence, backed up by their own training in constitutional institutions—by American sympathy, including both the Puritan and Jacobite, by a stream of dollars paid and promised, and by a network of internal organisation. And into this the Irish Priesthood have thrown themselves in a body, and the timid ones have been starved into joining by the withdrawal of dues. And then behind all is the long cultivated tradition of restitution of forfeited estates, and the recent fingering of the withheld rents, and the maddening excitement of moonlighting and the joys of spite. We do not mention all this as a high morality or a beautiful humanity, but only as a notorious matter of fact in recent and present Irish life. It is the output with which the Pope and Holy Office of the Inquisition deal, and one side of the equation not to be ignored by those who know nothing of the Irish at home or in America and Canada. Then on the other side, when these Irish come to consider the moralities of this whole complex problem, of course every one who knows them must expect profuse outpourings of devotedness, veneration, and submission, curiously modified with retractions, quibbles, distinguendos and evasions. And then, besides, have not the Irish Roman Catholic members boldly met and more boldly still denounced the intrusive action of the busy meddling priest—as they have almost called his Holiness—“Yes, these very men who used to kneel to bishops to back them at the polls; and have not meetings begun in “the Phoenix” endorsing the M.P.’s and denouncing the unnatural idea of forbidding “C.C.’s.” taking a part in politics, like as if ordering ducks not to dive. And then, again, of “the moralities” of the question—moralities indeed! from the Pope, whose two chief men in Ireland have notoriously backed Parnell, Boycotting, Land League, Plan of Campaign, as the winning horses; and now they are forbidden and ordered to back what but Balfour—Law and Order—Morality, Humanity, and the Holy Office. Is not that what is called “Hedging” on the turf? There is no name for it in the Church, unless morality and humanity are matters of policy and opportunism. Then again, some will think much of Eli, “whose sons made themselves vile and he restrained them not.” But if Eli was accessory after, the Pope is accessory before, aye, and towards, the fact these will acutely perceive. But what will it all ultimately

turn upon? and where absolutely be decided? “The enforcement of the Papal decision is made a matter to be carried out in the Confessional.” Very well. Then we take a glimpse at it. Mr. Darby Molloy goes to confess “at least once a year” (so Butler’s Catechism, p. 40, as revised, enlarged, improved, and recommended, &c., says): He is to confess all mortal sins occurring to the memory that are as yet not confessed. Well, Darby has a bad memory and a tough conscience, and being a Patriot and a tenant in the Plan, he won’t look on Boycotting or the Plan as a mortal sin, but as a work of supererogation of the highest merit. And he is to confess all his confessions to “Father Malachy,” the ex-chairman of the Parochial Branch of the ex-Land League, and active exponent and agent of all the actions taken under the Boycotting and the Plan. And we may be sure that this annual confession will be nicely timed before the annual collection of dues, just as the Pope’s censure is neatly issued *after* they are in *crumenâ*. Nor will the exhibition, as of two cocks in a pit, of the battle between the *Tablet* and *Freeman*, mend matters. Nor the speech of Dr. McGlynn, insolently retorting the Pope’s awful anathema restore the spiritual equilibrium. And if the Irish see any “rewards of divination” passings hands, for cursing instead of “blessing altogether,” will this pacify or reconcile them? They are taught, “in justice and conscience to contribute to the support of their pastors.” But they can teach their pastors “how much” and “for what.” One thing only is added, namely, that it is far wiser and more savouring of self-respect for the English people not to trust too much to this sudden Pontifical intervention and conversion on the spot. But, like the Irish, to look upon the move much as that of a fly perching upon a quartz-crusher. In this work Mr. Balfour had better go ahead, not with virulence or excess, nor without merciful and remedial measures. So much then of “The Irish Schism as a ridiculous bogey.”

PHILIP DWYER, A.M.

EDITORIAL.

TWELVE years have now passed over the head of the PULPIT, and while it has had much to stimulate its spread, and whilst it has seen contemporaries one after another rise and fall, it has not yet reached that stage of success which all its friends feel it deserves. With a view, therefore, to promote its circulation, we have decided to follow the example of many other leading periodicals, and reduce the price to one-half that which it has hitherto been, and for that reason we are now making arrangements to issue all numbers after July 1st at one penny per copy, in order to bring it within the range of a very large number of persons, for whom it should supply a long felt need. An allowance will of course be made on all subscriptions already paid, and we venture to trust that our

readers will take the opportunity of making known to their friends this important reduction in price.

IN future a skeleton children's Address will appear in our columns towards the conclusion of each month. The PULPIT being extensively read by the clergy, it has been suggested that notes for a Children's Service such as is often held on the 1st Sunday in the month on a subject connected with the season of the Christian year, would be a useful addition to the paper; we venture therefore to hope that some such thoughts as appear under the heading of "Children's Sermons" may be useful to those of our readers who desire help in addressing children.

NEWS sent for insertion must be accredited by the name and address of the writer. The Editor invites contributions of Church news of general interest. Wednesday is the last day on which matter for insertion in current week's number can be received.

CONTRIBUTIONS to the PULPIT should in future arrive not later than the first post on the Monday previous to publication.

THE subject of clerical work and preaching is again much canvassed, and not the less so in reference to the London clergy. We propose to lay before the readers of the PULPIT, in the next two issues, "Recollections of a Parish Priest," who was a well-known and very successful incumbent at Cambridge nearly fifty years ago. We do not doubt the energies or worth of many of our clergy, but we think there were wise and good men in England, who flourished as marked men before our time; and if the clergy of our day would study the lives of the fathers of our Church, and the ways and means by which their spiritual power was gained, they would not be losers, and the laity would be gainers.

THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
WARRENPOINT.

(Continued from page 237.)

CHAPTER VIII.

NORMAN CONQUEST.—THE ANGLO-ROMAN CHURCH OF IRELAND.

FROM the date of the Norman Conquest, the kings of England turned longing eyes on the fertile island which lay so close to their dominions; but it was not until the reign of Henry II. that those designs took the form of a regular invasion. Henry seems to have been in doubt for a time as to the claim which he should advance to cover his ambitious designs. At this period the Roman Pontiff was a power in Europe: he had blessed the enterprise of William the Conqueror, he had sanctioned the usurpation of Stephen, the chair of St. Peter was filled by an Englishman, Adrian IV., and to him Henry turned for sanction of his unscrupulous plans. Adrian listened favourably to the representations of John of Salisbury, Henry's

chaplain, and in 1155 issued a Bull, by which Ireland was handed over to the invaders for the promotion of true religion among her inhabitants. The king of Ireland was now little more than titular; the country was torn by internal feuds, the prelates and clergy had been for some years inclining more and more to the Roman obedience, the petty princes were always at war, the state of the country was particularly favourable to the designs of Henry. The king of Leinster was Dermot Mac Murchad, a rude, turbulent, and oppressive tyrant.

Between Dermot and Tiernan O'Ruarc, king of Breffny, there was a feud of old standing. Sixteen years before the English invasion Dermot had taken advantage of the troubles which surrounded O'Ruarc, to swoop down on Breffny and carry off Dervorghal his wife, the daughter of the king of Meath—a princess renowned for her beauty. The cause of O'Ruarc was taken up by Turlough O'Connor, the Ard Righ, who compelled Dermot to restore the princess of Breffny. When Mortough Mac Lachluin came to the throne Dermot joined his alliance, and while he lived O'Ruarc was constantly exposed to the attacks of his deadly enemy. But Mortough, in defiance of good faith, having seized upon the king of Uladh, put out his eyes; an outrage which enraged the other princes so much, that they conspired against the Ard Righ and defeated him in a great battle in which he lost his life. Roderic O'Connor who succeeded to the throne, was hostile to the cause of Dermot and a close ally of O'Ruarc. The province of Dermot was over-run with fire and sword. He fled the country and took refuge in England; here he learned that Henry was in France, whither he followed him and besought his assistance; but the king of England was just then overwhelmed with cares arising out of his quarrel with the Pope on one hand, and the rebellion of his French subjects on the other. The opportunity, however, was too good to be lost, and, accordingly, he gave Dermot letters patent empowering his subjects to aid him in the recovery of his kingdom. On his return the Irish prince addressed himself to the Earl of Pembroke. He stipulated to give him his daughter Eva in marriage, and to make him heir to his kingdom. He secured also the services of Robert Fitz Stephen, a brave soldier, and Maurice Fitz Gerald, a lord of considerable renown.

By lavish promises Dermot induced those barons to undertake an expedition which, begun as a private enterprise, was destined to prove of vast importance. Fitz Gerald and Fitz Stephen first broke the ice with three hundred and ninety men, consisting of thirty knights, sixty men in armour, and three hundred archers. They came over for the conquest of a warlike people in three ships, and landed in Ireland near the town of Wexford. Next day Maurice of Pendergast, a Welsh leader, arrived with ten knights and two hundred archers. Wexford was taken, but the task before the invaders was not an easy one; and but for the timidity of Roderic, and the disunion among the lesser chiefs, it would have been altogether frustrated. In the following summer Richard de Clare landed near Waterford: he had sent as his precursor the brave Raymond le Gros with a small band of knights and archers, which was increased upon their arrival by Hervey of Mountmorres with a few followers. They were attacked at Waterford by the Irish Danes, whom they defeated. Strongbow landed August 23rd, 1170, with about two hundred

knights and one thousand men. Waterford was taken by storm August 25th. A few hours later Dermot fulfilled his compact by giving his daughter Eva in marriage to the Norman baron, and the nuptials were celebrated while the city was still reeking with the slaughter which followed its capture: Strongbow advanced from Waterford to Dublin. While negotiations for the surrender of the city were going on between Laurence O'Toole, Archbishop of Dublin, and Strongbow, Miles de Cogan forced his way into the city, and before the leaders knew of the attack, Dublin had fallen and a terrible slaughter ensued. Dermot died in May, 1171, and on October 17th of the same year, Henry II. landed in person near Waterford with five hundred knights and about four thousand men-at-arms. He remained some time at Waterford and received the homage of many of the Irish princes, prelates, and abbots, who acknowledged his authority and swore fealty to him and his heirs. The prelates who submitted were required to confirm their act by written instruments which Henry forwarded to the Pope for confirmation; he also issued his mandate convening the Synod of Cashel; Henry spent fifteen days in Waterford and then went on to Dublin, where he remained from November, 1171, until March, 1172. If Henry had remained in Ireland to settle the affairs of the kingdom, matters might have turned out differently; but the commotions raised by his sons called him away April 17th, 1172, and the Norman adventurers whom he left to administer the country cared for nothing but their own aggrandisement. How Henry with a handful of men took possession of the island, and established there a power which has never since been overthrown has puzzled many. The distracted condition of the country seems to have been the cause. The vast mass of the people, worn out by war and feud, cared nothing for independence, they cared little for life, centuries of wild commotion had broken the spirit of the once gallant Celt, and in defeat or in victory he saw little difference, except indeed a choice of masters; the clergy saw in Henry a man whom the Pope delighted to honour, and at the outset when alone resistance was possible, they threw their weight into the cause of the Norman. And they had their reward. When Henry came over no great battle was fought; no blood shed; no blow struck; no castle was erected during his stay in Ireland, but the time soon came when one by one the native lords were crushed by the English power, when English institutions supplanted in the Island of Saints the religious houses which once were adorned by the learning, the zeal, and the piety of Irish ecclesiastics, when the dignities and the emoluments of the Irish Church were carefully distributed so as to exclude from place and power the clergy of native birth. The Norman adventurers as time went on reared many a stately abbey, and endowed many a wealthy shrine to atone for lives of rapine and bloodshed; but the cloisters were filled with imported monks, and the offerings were devoted to the maintenance of foreign ecclesiastics. In the eyes of the haughty Norman conquerors, the Irish serf was a hewer of wood and a drawer of water.

We have already mentioned that prior to his departure, Henry issued his mandate convening the Synod of Cashel. The Synod was not held until 1172. The Primate Gelasius declined to attend, but Christian of Lismore presided as Papal Legate. The decrees of the council were directed: (I.) To the restriction of Marriage within Canonical regulations; (II.) To the

due performance of Baptism; (III.) To the payment of tithes; (IV.) To the protection of Church lands from lay encroachments; (V.) To the exemption of the clergy from Eric, in cases of homicide committed by laymen; (VI.) To the making of wills; (VII.) To arrange for the due performance of the Rites of Burial; (VIII.) To bring the Irish Church from henceforth into full accordance with the Anglican Communion. Such were the reforms which cost a national Church her freedom. Such was the mess of pottage for which the Irish Church, the Church of Patrick and Columba and Columbanus, sold her birth-right. The proceedings were closed by a declaration expressed in terms of abject humility, setting forth the reasons why the Church of Ireland should conform to that of England.*

Some short time after the Synod had been held, Henry sent to Pope Alexander the decrees which had been adopted, and he also sent him the letters of submission of the Irish prelates. On September 20th, 1172, Alexander replied to Henry, and to the prelates and nobles of Ireland. To the king he writes thus: "Your excellency is aware that the Roman Church has by right an authority over islands, different from what she possesses over the mainland and Continent. Having therefore such a confident hope in the fervour of your devotion as to believe it would be your desire not only to conserve but also to extend the privileges of the said Church and to establish her jurisdiction, as you are in duty bound where she has none, we ask and earnestly urge your Highness to study diligently, to preserve to us in the aforesaid land the rights of St. Peter; and if the said Church have no jurisdiction there that your highness should assign and appoint it to her." He also issued a brief confirming the Bull of Adrian, in which he describes Ireland as "the barbarous nation," expressing a hope that now it might attain to "some decency of manners."

In vain Laurence O'Toole, who succeeded Archbishop Gregory in the see of Dublin in 1161, exerted his influence to ameliorate the condition of his countrymen. He had been a devoted champion of the Roman See, and had spent his life in advancing the interests of the Church. Yet he was forced to look on while the Church betrayed the nation, and while the Supreme Pontiff to justify that betrayal, blackened the fair fame of the Church of St. Patrick. Of Laurence O'Toole, Professor Stokes says: "He was pious, learned, and devout. He was distinguished for his generosity, his mercy, and his courage. He was devoted to the work and cause of God's Church as he knew and understood it, and he died as he lived doing that work." He died November 14th, 1180.†

Before Henry left Ireland he made arrangements for the future administration of the country, or rather of that part of it in which his authority was recognised. The Irish princes who submitted were treated as vassals of the English crown. Earl Strongbow was confirmed in possession of Leinster to hold it as a fief of the crown of England. Meath was given to Hugh de Lacy; Ulster, whose chiefs had scorned submission, was granted to De Courcy. The adventurers, as being English subjects, were still to be governed by English laws. Waterford was given by charter to the Danes; the districts subject to his authority, Henry divided

* Giraldus Cambrensis Hibernia Expugnata. King, II. pp. 515-517; Killen, I., pp. 219-222; Wordsworth, "Church of Ireland," p. 104; Leland, I. pp. 75, 76.

† Stokes; Ireland and the Celtic Church, p. 328.

into counties and appointed in them sheriffs and judges. A chief governor also was appointed to rule Ireland in the king's absence; Dublin was conferred by charter upon the citizens of Bristol. Then, indeed, the eyes of the Irish were opened to the true object of the invasion, but the knowledge came too late. Roderic held out till 1175, when he concluded a treaty with the English monarch by which he agreed to become a tributary to Henry, who in return recognised him as king of all Ireland except the English Pale. The Pale consisted of Dublin with all its appurtenances; Meath, Wexford, the whole of Leinster; Waterford with all its appurtenances as far as Dungarvan. Strongbow died at Dublin, June, 1176, and William Fitz Aldelm was appointed to succeed him as viceroy of Ireland.

Gerald Barry, better known as Giraldus Cambrensis, a somewhat pedantic Churchman, has left us an account most valuable indeed, but not always trustworthy, of the state of Ireland at the time of the Norman invasion. He was not much in favour with the Irish ecclesiastics, and on one occasion he flipperantly reproached Irish Christians with the want of martyrs. "Alas!" replied the Archbishop of Cashel who was present, "as yet our people have not learned to murder God's servants, but now that Englishmen have settled in Ireland and Henry is our king, we may soon have martyrs enough to remove this reproach from our Church."

And certainly the native ecclesiastics soon had bitter cause to regret the downfall of Irish independence. The pastoral staff of the patriarchs of Ireland—the staff of Jesus—was transferred from Armagh to the centre of English influence at Dublin, and on the death of Laurence O'Toole, Archbishop of Dublin in 1180, an Englishman, John Comyn, was advanced to the post. Comyn was the first Englishman who presided over an Irish see, but from his consecration in 1182 no Irishman filled the see of Dublin for five hundred years from 1182 to 1663. As regards the early Irish Church generally, Archbishop Ussher says—"As far as I can collect by such records of the former ages as have come into my hands, either manuscripts or printed, the religion professed by the ancient bishops, priests, monks, and other Christians in this land, was for the substance the very same with that which now, by public authority, is maintained therein against the foreign doctrine brought in thither in later times by the Bishop of Rome's followers."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHURCH ARMY.

SIR,—One cannot take up your valuable paper, without noticing that on all sides clergy are seeking for some means to win the working classes to the Church.

Allow me to call your attention to an organisation which solves this question. The Church Army (36, Southampton Street, Strand, London, W.C.) is a working man's church mission to working men. It is a society or guild within the Church, and is the Church's active handmaiden, having its basis as wide as the Church of England. The Church Army is

diocesan because no agent can be brought into any diocese without the sanction of the bishop. It is parochial, because no officer may either commence or continue in any parish, without the sanction of the vicar. It has received the encouragement of the two archbishops and seven bishops. One vicar, who has had the Church Army working in his parish, says: "It has solved more problems and brought more souls to Christ than any other organisation I know of, in the same amount of time. Men are now sober and God-fearing, who before have been known to sell the shoes from their feet, and the shirts from their backs to purchase beer. Others have been rescued from the depths of moral degradation. All are now prepared to testify to the misery of a vicious life, and to the happiness which they are experiencing as disciples of Christ, even though they are conscious of not yet having attained to the fulfilment of all His requirements. More than forty persons have already given in their names for confirmation, nineteen for adult baptism."

So much for the working of the Church Army in one parish alone. To sum up, the following figures will show the general results in two years' time:—3,000 adults, professing true conversion, have been confirmed; 1,000 more are waiting to be confirmed. 5,000 regular communicant members. 100 earnest clergymen directing the work in their own parishes.

FREDERICK BURNSIDE.

"ST. JOHN: THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL."

SIR,—My ancient antagonist, "Your Reviewer," appears to have read my book backwards, and to have devoted his critical acumen chiefly to a consideration of the advertisements! I am sorry that these are not arranged to his taste, as the self-constituted representative of the "casual reader," who, however, I would fain hope is not so dreadfully dense as he makes out. Your reviewer's statement that "some remarks of Dr. Hayman on one book do duty for both," is simply untrue in point of fact; his bias having unfortunately rendered him blind to the real connection of the paragraph. Indeed, your reviewer's *animus* throughout is so ill-concealed, that no word is needed from me in reply to his critique. I am well content to submit my book, and the notices of my former works to the dispassionate judgment of all impartial readers.

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 22nd, 1888.

[Our correspondent is wrong in attributing the notice of his recent book to his "ancient antagonist" who reviewed "St. Paul, the Author of the Acts and the third Gospel" in our 21st volume. We purposely entrusted it to another most eminent and judicial scholar, whose name, were we at liberty to mention it, would render the imputation of *animus* absurd in the estimation of all Greek Testament scholars. ED.]

JACOB'S FRAUD.

SIR,—The question ventilated by "Presbyter" and Mr. J. J. Murphy of Belfast becomes of gigantic proportions.

1. Mr. Murphy does not believe the story, but, as

it is referred to in Heb. xii. 16, 17, as an historical fact, both Testaments must stand or fall together.

2. "Presbyter" tells us that it is of no consequence whether the story be strictly true, an exaggerated account, or a pure fiction, that, as it is recorded by an inspired writer, the question is whether this inspired writer is or is not trustworthy as a describer of the Divine mind and actions. "Presbyter" says that God changes not, but that those who depict His character come out "more and more clearly by degrees," till their report "reached its glorious climax in the incarnate Son," etc., p. 226. Again, p. 190, "The God Whom we Christians adore is not the God portrayed in Genesis, or even in the Psalter," etc. He thinks that the difficulty will be removed by "the distinction between inspiration and infallibility," p. 190. Allowing that inspired messages may assume something of the mental character of the man who reports them, still to deprive them of infallibility would be to make them useless as messages from God, if not to deprive God Himself of infallibility.

3. But I see nothing in this story to drive us to think it false, or an unworthy picture of the infallible and impeccable God. Let us look at the whole story. God always intended that the head of His Israel should be Jacob and not Esau. This He could bear at no loss how lawfully to carry out. Rebekah and Jacob grasping, probably, temporal blessings rather than the spiritual, gained their end by fraud. Was God therefore to be foiled in His purpose as to the headship? Certainly not! But He inspired Isaac to tell Esau that, in future years, his descendants should free themselves from the yoke of Israel, which accordingly took place. If what Rebekah and Jacob grasped at was present prosperity and rule over Esau, they were completely disappointed. "Evil," Jacob told Pharaoh, "have the days of my life been." "Presbyter's" words are actually revolting for their impiety. At p. 190 we read, "Your Bible tells you that God, so far from expressing any disapproval of it (Jacob's fraud), or withholding the blessing from the thief who tried to steal it by a lie, rewarded him by making the blessing over to him irrevocably, and thus became a participator in his evil doing." Is there anything worse than this in Hume or any other infidel writer? I say from my heart, "Father, forgive him, for he knows not what he says." If it were I, or any one else, or even an inspired prophet who was blamed, I could have kept my mouth as it were with a bridle. "But when thou thoughtest that He was a man like thyself, when this talking was against the Most High, then the fire burned and I spake with my tongue. That He might be justified in His saying, and clear when He is judged."

4. How could God condemn lying lips and a deceitful tongue more than He has all through the Bible? How could He punish Jacob more than He did all through his life, still keeping to His own purpose, that the holy nation should descend from Jacob and not from Esau? Was not Jacob deprived of that present superiority which, probably, was all that he grasped at? Did not his trials begin from the very day of his sin? See how Laban cheated him and tyrannised over him during his twenty-one years bondage? See the disunion among his sons, Reuben's wrong to him; Joseph torn from him! See him grovelling before Esau, whom he thought to rule, trembling for wives and children, propitiating with flocks and herds him, who had more abundance of his own! If any one wanted to see God set forth

as an unsparing punisher of lies and deceit, let him read the story of Jacob's punishment, deprived of all he grasped at, except that of which perhaps he thought not at all, the future headship of the Church of God!

5. One might as well say that the account of David is, if inspired, at least not infallible. The kingdom was decreed to him and he had it. See his sin; why it almost outdoes the Roman depravity of Augustus. No sooner does he cast his eyes upon the object of his desire than, like a brute beast, he must have instant gratification. Then to secure impunity see all his arts! When detection must come, murder is called in to conceal it. Not a needless moment is lost after the murder is effected. A hasty marriage shall cover all. Well, what is the history of his family? A series of monstrous crimes begun in imitation of his. His son only walked in his steps, and yet for a year God speaks not. So long was He liable to such accusations, as "Presbyter" deals forth in the case of Jacob. Then, indeed, God speaks by Nathan; well, how know we what messages He sent to Jacob—messages perhaps known to his sons and others? At any rate in every page of the Bible God denounces lies and treachery, and needed not to say that Jacob's afflictions were the reward of his sins. Waiting to see what "Presbyter" and Mr. Murphy have to say, I here take leave.

C.C.V.-G.

SIR,—I think I can agree with everything in "Presbyter's" letter in the PULPIT of the 12th. The progressiveness of revelation is asserted in both the Old and the New Testament, and is an obvious fact, unless the word revelation is to have no meaning. But I think it comes dangerously near to saying that God is not "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," if we maintain that He sanctioned Jacob's fraud by transferring the birthright and the blessing to him from Esau. We must remember that it is a case not only of *permitting* a wrong, which God may be said to do whenever He lets a wrong go unpunished, but of *sanctioning* the wrong, by transferring to Jacob as its result the privilege of being the heir of Abraham and the ancestor of Christ. I say, as I said before, that meeting with a story that ascribes such action to God in the Book of Genesis, I can no more believe it than if I found it in Herodotus: and this although I am an evangelical believer, or rather *because* I am an evangelical believer.

"Presbyter" is quite right in saying that if we believe the story to be untrue, this in no degree lessens whatever moral difficulty there is in finding it in a book of canonical Scripture. But we must make up our minds to admit the fact that the historical books of the Bible are by no means exempt from error. This avowal may be thought dangerous; but is it not far more dangerous to teach that we cannot believe in the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and the Ascension of our Lord, unless we also believe that God gave His sanction to Jacob's fraud on his father and his brother?

"Presbyter" suggests as possible that the story may be "a legendary version of some real occurrence." This is likely enough; and it is likely enough that if we knew all the facts, Jacob's conduct might appear defensible. But, as "Presbyter" candidly admits, it makes no difference whatever to the question of inspiration whether this is so or not.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 13th May, 1888.

Reviews and Notices.

"TENCH WHITE'S ORGAN LIBRARY BOOK." Canterbury: Tench White.

THIS is a collection of twelve voluntaries or interludes for small organ or harmonium use, short, easy, and for the most part with a well-defined melody. Attention is paid to the progression of parts, and the sustained pedal notes are introduced effectively. If anything, the frequent recurrence of modulation and accidentals is a drawback, especially to inexperienced performers. Perhaps the March in D and the Offertoire are the most spirited. The little volume is a useful contribution to that constantly sought and yet not always to be found type of music, the simple voluntary, which will commend itself to those who are not equal to performing pieces having a more complicated subject than the Hymn Tune or Kyrie usually presents.

"THE POPE IN POLITICS: GREAT SPEECH OF FATHER MCGLYNN OF NEW YORK." Dublin: Mcreedy & Kyle, Middle Abbey Street. Price by post 2d.

THIS pamphlet is a striking feature of the times. A New York priest, Father McGlynn, having adopted Mr. Henry George's doctrines as to the rights or non-rights of property, has been summoned to Rome for disobedience, and refusing compliance, has been excommunicated. But he has a multitude to stand by him. As the Pope is against him, so he is against the Pope; his temporal power, his meddling with politics, and his pretence to personal infallibility. He ridicules his pomp, and his pretence to be an arbiter between kings. He asks what Bismarck would say to his claiming to arbitrate about Alsace and Lorraine, merely because when Bismarck wanted to get out of his Caroline difficulty with Spain, he left it to the Pope to make his retreat respectable, pp. 13, 14. He says that the real stickers up for Papal political rule are the English and American converts, in opposition to the Irish, who are for Ireland defying England, backed up by the Pope, the bishops and the priests. The ultra-Martin Luther-style of this speech may be learnt from one sentence, p. 15, "The infallible Pope who can never do anything wrong, or do anything unwise, this infallible or impeccable Pope, whom it would seem as if it were the duty of every one to consider impeccable, has time and again bedeviled the politics of nations, as to-day he does the politics of Italy." Every word of it is worth reading and studying as a harbinger of coming change.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Abbott, Rev. D. W., Master of Lincoln Preparatory School; Vicar of Cherry Willingham, near Lincoln.
 Anderson, Rev. F. W., M.A., Vicar of All Souls', Brighton.
 Boughton-Leigh, Rev. Bridgeman George, M.A., Curate of St. Andrew's, Brighton; Rector of Harborough Magna, Rugby.
 Bowden-Smith, Rev. F. H., Rector of Western Patrick, Hants; Rural Dean of Odiham.
 Brand, Rev. Hamilton, Rector of Farthingstone, Weedon.
 Carter, Rev. W. S., M.A., Sunday Evening Lecturer at St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington.
 Cary, Rev. Offley Henry, M.A., Rector of Trusham, Devonshire.
 Clark, Rev. William, M.A., H.M. Chaplain, Bombay Ecclesiastical Establishment; Rector of Bunbury, Cheshire.
 Deacle, Rev. E. L. Y., Vicar of Messing, Essex.
 Elton, Rev. Edward Daubeney, B.A., Rector of Hopton Castle, Salop.
 Finzel, Rev. C. W. C., Vicar of Stokenham with Chivelstone and Sherford, Devonshire.
 Franklin, Rev. E. J., Vicar of Whitchurch.
 Fyffe, Rev. E. F., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Orlando*.
 Gaskell, Rev. Thomas Kynaston, M.A., Vicar of Leaton, Salop.
 Gornall, Rev. James, Rector of Sotby.
 Gornall, Rev. James, Vicar of Market Stainton, Lincolnshire.
 Gronow, Rev. Rees Grimsdale, M.A., Incumbent of Capethorne, Cheshire; Rector of Baginton, Warwickshire.
 Hamilton, Rev. C. Chetwode, M.A., Vicar of Fillongley, Warwickshire; Vicar of Tettenhall, Staffordshire.
 Hamilton, Rev. C. Douglas, Curate of St. Helen's, Ipswich; Chaplain to the Bishop of Hong Kong and Chaplain to the Garrison at that British Station.
 Hodgkinson, Rev. Robert John, M.A., Rector of Trowell, Nottinghamshire.
 Hoskin, Rev. S., Rector of Sheepwash, near Highampton.
 Leeson, Rev. Thomas H., Curate of St. Matthew's, Birmingham; Vicar of Christ Church, Charnock Richard, Chorley.
 MacDougall, Rev. Thomas Hugh, M.A., Vicar of South Cave, Yorkshire.
 Mills, Rev. J. R., M.A., Vicar of Neasden-cum-Kingsbury; Vicar of St. Michael's, Coventry.
 Mitford, Rev. E., Vicar of Muston; Vicar of Hunmanby All Saints, Yorkshire.
 Monck, Rev. E. F. B., B.A., Vicar of Netherfield, Sussex.
 Morgan, Rev. Edward, B.A., Curate of St. Andrew's, Cardiff; Perpetual Curate of Llanishen-with-Lisoane.
 Nugee, Rev. Francis Edward, M.A., Vicar of Sneynton, Nottingham.
 Pearson, Rev. Lewis H., Assistant Master of the Harper Schools, Bedford; Head Master of the Amersham Grammar School.
 Rigden, Rev. Richard, Curate of Penkridge, diocese of Lichfield; Vicar of Castle Bromwich, Worcestershire.
 Ross, Rev. Frederick John, B.A., Rector of Staunton-with-Flawborough, Nottinghamshire.
 Short, Rev. Walter Francis, Rector of Donhead St. Mary's; Rural Dean of the Tisbury Portion of the Chalke Rural Deanery.
 Smith, Rev. A. L., Vicar of St. Paul's, Birmingham.
 Taylor, Rev. Charles Hellins, M.A., Vicar of Milton Abbots, Devonshire.
 Tickell, Rev. Henry Edmund Du Main, B.A., Vicar of Dunsford, Devonshire.
 Tuck, Rev. George John, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Newton, Herefordshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Butterfield, Rev. John, M.A., at Forest Gate, on the 16th inst., aged 93.
 Cather, Venerable John, Archdeacon of Tuam, at Westport Rectory, County Mayo, on the 15th inst., aged 74.
 Hart, Rev. R. H., M.A., Vicar of Dunston, on the 14th inst., aged 58.
 Sotherby, Rev. Thomas, Hans, Rector of Langford Budville, at Holy Trinity Vicarage, Hoxton, on the 21st inst., aged 78.
 Stevens, Rev. Thomas, late Warden of Bradfield College, Berks, at Toft-Newton Rectory, on the 15th inst., the eve of his 79th birthday.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SYMPATHY OF CHRIST.

BY REV J. PATERSON SMYTH, B.D. LL.B.,
ASSISTANT MINISTER OF HAROLD'S CROSS,
DUBLIN.

SERMON PREACHED IN CHRIST CHURCH CATHEDRAL, DUBLIN, ON THE 1ST SUNDAY IN LENT, 1888.

"For we have not an High Priest who cannot sympathize with our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."—HEB. iv. 15, 16.

YOU will notice that I have slightly altered the reading of the 15th verse. The expression "be touched with a feeling of," means just the same as "sympathize with" our infirmities, but the Greek word used is "sympathein" (*συμπαθεῖν*) the original of our English verb to sympathize, and besides the word "which I have used" strikes more directly the keynote as it were of our subject to-day.

THE SYMPATHY OF JESUS CHRIST.

(1.) Now first, it is very important that we should not narrow the true meaning of this word Sympathy. What do we each mean by it? What idea does it convey to our minds? Is it merely that if someone were in sore need, sickness, or any other adversity we should pity him, we should feel very sorry for him—Is that our notion of sympathy? for remember that is but a small part of its meaning. Sympathy has to do with joy as well as with sorrow—with the merry romping of boys and girls at their play, just as much as with the trouble that is breaking the heart of our friend. Sympathy means not merely the feeling *for* a man but (as its derivation shows) the feeling *with* him—the putting yourself in his place—the trying to understand and think yourself into the feelings of others of whatever kind they are, that thus you may be the better able to help and cheer and brighten human life around you. And oh, brethren (let me say in passing), how much brighter and gladder all life would be if people would try to do this—if fathers and mothers would think themselves into the feelings of their children, remembering the days when they were boys and girls themselves—if employers would think themselves into the feelings of their servants—if the strong would try to understand the feelings of the weak—if the happy would realize the position of the wretched—if the man unintentionally offended by another would think himself into the place of him who had offended him—in a word, if we would all learn more to get outside the crust of our own miserable

Vol. XXV.—No. 649.

little selves and try more to understand and appreciate and enter into the great world of thought and will and feeling existing in the lives of men and women around us.

(2.) When you take the word thus in its full accurate meaning, I daresay the thought will occur to you that there are many cases where it is not possible for you thus to sympathize with others—cases where, however much you try, you are in a great measure unable to "put yourself in the place" of another, because you have never experienced the same feelings yourself. If, for example, you have never been very poor or very sick, or very sorely tempted to some special sin, it is hard for you to understand—to make allowance for, to put yourself in the place of one who has.

You get angry with the drunkard who is ruining the peace of his home, you have no sympathy with the miserable weakness that has caused the breaking of his pledge after a month's struggle—you don't understand the awful craving—you don't know how hard the struggle may have been, you can pity him perhaps—you can feel *for* him, but you cannot feel *with* him—you cannot put yourself in his place.

One often feels this too, in meeting with cases of terrible pain and sickness, and especially in those crushing bereavements which a Clergyman so frequently meets in his parish visits. If you have never known much of pain or sickness yourself—if you have never had any real trouble in your own life—though you do really pity them—though you would do anything in the world to help them that you could, yet you know you cannot thoroughly sympathize with them, like one who has himself known pain and sorrow—you cannot put yourself in their place.

(3.) And people do so long for this sympathy, the fervent grip of the hand that shows you understand them, that you have felt the same thing yourself and know to the full how very hard it is to bear—even that, when you can do nothing else to relieve them, is itself a very great help.

I was told recently of a man in a neighbouring parish to whom had come a crushing family affliction. He didn't care to talk about it with his clergy, he did not go to his most intimate friends, tender and loving though they would have been—No, there was another man, a mere acquaintance, who had had a similar trouble a little while before, and instinctively he turned to him for comfort and sympathy. Whatever else this man lacked he knew at least that he could understand him—that he had been through it all himself, and had felt all its bitterness, and therefore that he could sympathize with him and comfort him, as no one else among his friends could.

(4.) Now I think we need these thoughts to help us in understanding our text to-day. Even when we wish to do so *we* cannot always sympathize with others, but this passage tells us that "we

have not an High Priest who cannot sympathize with our infirmities; having been in all points tempted, *i.e.*, *tried*, like as we are—like us in our pain and weariness, and sadness and disappointment—like us in the common experiences of daily life—like us in all things, but that in which we could not bear to have him like us—the foolishness, wilfulness and sin, that are daily spoiling and defiling our lives.

I think it should be very helpful to us to dwell upon this perfect humanity of the Lord Jesus, to remember that all our little pains and weariness and worries and discouragements, as well as the great troubles and temptations that rend at times our very souls within us are thoroughly understood by Him who sits to-day in the midst of the throne of God.

And no mere statement of the fact, however forcible, could ever bring this home to us as the simple story of His life does. The writer of the passage seems to feel this himself, and therefore, it is he adds what I want to emphasize for you, as the greatest help to resting in the sympathy of Christ.

I.—“HE WAS IN ALL POINTS TRIED LIKE AS WE ARE.”—Which would you rather have, merely the statement that He could understand and sympathize with people WEARY AND OVERWORKED; or in addition to it, that graphic little touch in the Gospel of St. Matthew, telling how, after a long tiring day of preaching and teaching, and healing the sick who were brought unto Him, at evening He went into a little boat to cross the lake, and He was so tired that he fell fast asleep on the hard flooring of the fishing boat; so utterly weary that even the howling of the storm around could not awake Him till the frightened disciples shouted in His ear, Lord, save us—we perish.

Would you rather be merely told that he understands the feelings and experiences of PLAIN, HUMBLE, POOR PEOPLE, or to be told also that He was born a poor country carpenter's child—that He lived the hard life of a poor man—that He was hungry and thirsty—that He had not where to lay his head—that He was sneered at by the more respectable classes at Nazareth as that “carpenter's son,” who had set up to teach His betters.

Would you rather merely hear that He could feel for you when you are tossing on your bed in PAIN AND SICKNESS, or to know in addition that for long weary hours He Himself hung with throbbing brow and racking limbs, and every nerve quivering with intensest agony.

Does it not help you to understand His sympathy in SORROW when you learn that He was Himself the Man of Sorrows—that He lived a troubled lonely life—that the hot tears had trickled down His cheeks, and if you want to go farther than mere sorrow, to be told of that crushing mental anguish that wrung great drops as it were of blood from his brow, in the awful night of Gethsemane.

Does it not comfort you, when crying to God

for your boy gone wrong, to know how He “grieved for the hardness of men's hearts.”

Does it not help you when you are lonely and troubled and longing for human sympathy; or in those darker days still when the very Heavens seem as brass above you, and God seems to have gone away into the darkness—to remember that He had once to beseech His human friends, Tarry ye here, and watch with me—that He had to cry aloud in the desolation of His soul “My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?”

Do you not think when a man is poor or sick, or tired, or lonely, or in trouble—and which of us is not so at some time or other—that such facts as these will help him to understand that Jesus Christ can “put Himself in his place, and enter into his feelings, for which cause it behoved Him to be made in all things like unto His brethren.

And if you want still better to understand His sympathy, study still more closely His blessed life on earth, examine

II.—HIS INTERCOURSE WITH MEN AND WOMEN LIKE YOURSELF—who came in contact with Him long ago—who might easily have been misunderstood and blamed, and condemned by anyone of less exquisite sympathy than He.

(1.) Look at that story which I have just referred to, where in the moonlight shadows of Gethsemane He was wrestling in His mysterious agony and His three favourite disciples, the men whom he had chosen out of all the world to be closest to Himself—who should have been watching in sympathy beside Him and thinking how they could comfort their agonized Master, they were where? Calmly lying on the garden grass *fast asleep!* They could not watch with Him one hour. Ah, how keenly some of us would have felt—how sharply we should have judged them, if someday writhing in bitter anguish of spirit we saw our nearest and dearest—those who professed to love us best, calmly sleeping through it all, leaving us to bear the heavy burden by ourselves unhelped, unpitied, alone. How little we would try to understand them or excuse them.

Not so the Lord Jesus. He did not blame these disciples, he did not misunderstand them, or misconstrue their conduct. Ah, no. “The spirit is willing” said he, “the spirit is willing, only the flesh is weak.” He knew it was not want of love. He knew it was not that they did not care but that they were poor, weak men and that they were very tired.

O men and women, should not that story be helpful to us, of Jesus Christ actually excusing, making apologies for his sleeping disciples, actually stopping to understand them and look for the good in them, where anybody else would have seen only the evil. I think if there is one thing above all else, that would draw me to Him, as to a friend it is that. It is a good thing to have a friend who can plainly see my faults and fearlessly rebuke me

for them ; but oh, I think the friend who will be really helpful to me, is the man who can see the good in me as well as the evil—who can see the good motive at the bottom of my mistaken action—who can see my hard secret struggle with temptation—who can understand the sorrow and regret arising in my heart where the world around sees but my failure and my sin.

Such a friend we have in Jesus Christ. Think of it, my brethren, and take comfort from it. Is there someone here to-day very dissatisfied about his spiritual life, feeling that his heart is dull and his devotion cold, and his spirit flagging and growing tired, even at the holy table ; he cannot watch with Christ one hour. He feels so discouraged as he thinks how the Lord must regard him, and yet in his inmost soul, in spite of it all he knows that he is longing to love Him and get closer to Him every day.

Take courage, my brother, from His sympathy with the sleeping disciples. Fear not, He will not think it is want of love. He will look for the best in you, and make the best of you. He can sympathize with your infirmities when you feel dull and coldhearted. He can put Himself in your place. Perhaps He is saying of you this day—be sure He is if it is possible to say it of you—"The spirit I know is willing, only the flesh is weak."

(2.) Or is there someone here very weak in faith, almost inclined to say at times "I don't believe I have any faith in God." Is there some one disturbed with sceptical doubts—I don't mean those sham doubts of men who are aping the sceptic because they think it looks clever, but the real honest doubts that rend the very soul when all that one holds dearest seems slipping away.

My brother, have faith in God. Trust in the sympathy of Christ. Don't be one bit afraid that he will misunderstand you. He could put Himself in the place of the poor doubter who cried, "Lord, help thou mine unbelief." He could sympathize with the scepticism of Thomas, even while He reproved him for it ; and—you remember the story—when those few loving simple-hearted women came with their spices and ointments in the early morning while it was yet dark, though their very errand showed an almost utter disbelief in the promise that He would rise again, yet he could put Himself in their place. He knew how hard it was for them to receive such a stupendous mystery—He knew at least that they cared greatly for Him, else they would not have been there at all. And so He accepted them in the blind confusion of their hearts and spoke to them kindly and lovingly.

And He is still the same, able to put Himself in your place too ; and if you are in earnest in crying to Him in the grey cold morning of doubt and disturbance, while it is yet dark ; for you too the stone will be rolled away—to you too will be granted the Blessed Vision of the Lord.

(3.) Or are you fretting over the weakness that has led you into some sin, your besetting sin, whatever it be. The last time it was committed you vowed on your knees in God's strength, that you would carefully watch yourself against it in the future. And now you have gone deliberately and yielded to it again, and feel ashamed to ask God for forgiveness any more. And yet you are longing to be forgiven and received as a repentant child again.

Do you remember that cowardly sin of St. Peter, and the going out into the darkness to weep bitterly. Can't you understand the black bitter thoughts seething in his soul, that awful Good Friday. The Master who so specially loved and trusted him, who had picked him out from among all men as His intimate friend ; that kindly Master lying cold and stiff in Joseph of Arimathea's tomb, done to death by those who hated Him—forsaken by those who should have laid down their lives for Him ; and the last words his dead Master had heard from him, were words of blasphemous denial. Oh, it must have been a bitter time for him.

But did you ever think how that Master was all the time sympathizing with His poor sorrowing disciple, not merely forgiving him and pitying him, but actually putting Himself in his place, entering into the feeling of his torturing remorse. Did you ever think of the loving, considerate, thoughtful sympathy of that message which He left with the angels for the women at the tomb. "Go, tell My disciples, and Peter !" and *Peter* ! Peter who is breaking his heart in his remorse—Peter who most of all needs My comfort to day—tell him especially. Oh ! no wonder that Peter should be drawn to Him so closely ; no wonder that burst of eager passionate devotion, "Lord, thou knowest all things thou knowest, thou knowest, that I love Thee !"

My brethren, you who are humbly following Jesus Christ, if you want more trust, more joy in your religion, if you want to love Him passionately as Peter of old, try to learn right thoughts of Him ; try to know Him even as Peter knew Him. That is the only way to learn to love Him. That is how you have learned to love and trust your wife, your husband, your nearest and dearest friend. Gradually and by degrees their character was revealed to you. You learned to know them by constant intercourse. And now you have got to love them so that you would give your very life for their sakes. You have got to believe in them, so that you would fearlessly trust your all in their keeping. Thus too you must learn to love and trust Jesus Christ. There is only one rule for learning to love and trust anybody, God or man—by learning to know them. Therefore, pray that you may really know Him as you know your nearest and dearest. Study the Bible and especially the Gospels—not merely to understand doctrines and explain prophecies and be wise in religious theories, but to understand God—to get yourself into touch

with the great heart of Jesus Christ, for, oh, I think it only needs the real knowledge of that heart "to draw all men unto Him."

III.—Just one thought in conclusion. Does the perplexing question sometimes rise within you, even though you shrink from putting it into words, "How can that depth of sympathy exist without bringing us relief from all our trouble? Sorrow and pain, and disease and death are creeping into our homes and almost breaking our hearts, and He rebukes them not. Some of us have hard, troubled, fretted lives; some of us have secret troubles that we dare not tell to any man. Even poor earthly sympathy, if it had the power, would remove at once this misery of life, yet Jesus Christ who has all power even to raise up again our dear ones in the grave, He lets these troubles come.

Brethren, I don't want to make light of that difficulty. Better men than you or I have felt it sorely, and we shall never be able to solve it fully till all the mystery of life is over by-and-bye. But when we remember all that God says and all that God has done to show His sympathy with us, will not some things in our experience help us a little.

Did you never see a mother insisting that the bitter medicine should be taken, and ceasing not at all for the crying of her child. Were you never present at a surgical operation to see the look of terror on the little patient's face, as his father refused to rescue him from his pain. Have you never seen a school boy fretting and spoiling his sunny playhours over a hard lesson which his father could do for him in a moment if he would, and yet for the boy's sake the father refuses.

As you think of such things, my brethren, is it too much to ask you to believe in the sympathy of Christ, even though troubles that He could hinder are allowed to come to you. When you know that for your sake He let troubles come to Himself, that He could have hindered—pain and sorrow, and weariness and disrespect and misunderstandings—that he compelled Himself, "for us and for our salvation," to endure the agony of Gethsemane and the Cross of Calvary, though a word would have brought to Him legions of Angels. When you know how His heart went forth to sorrow and sickness, how delicately He sympathized with weakness and failings; how thoroughly He "put Himself in men's place" when others around would have blamed and misunderstood them. Oh, brethren, will we not all try to think about it and pray about it, and take courage from it, and weak and cold-hearted, and sinful, and doubting, and wavering as we are, will we not all thank God for this blessed truth, "that we have not an High Priest who cannot sympathize with our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

FUTURE RETRIBUTION.*

PREBENDARY ROW has written many valuable books, and the present is not less so than its predecessors. For logical acumen, clearness of exposition, and the excellent marshalling of his *data* in support of his arguments, the theological student could not wish for a better display. He begins by asking two questions: (1) "Shall we continue to exist, as personal conscious beings, capable of happiness or misery, after the death of our bodies; or will death be a sleep from which there will be no awakening?" (2) Assuming that we shall continue thus to exist, what are the conditions on which our happiness or misery will depend in the unseen world?" A third question might be added which is fully discussed elsewhere. If we rise again, shall we *of necessity* be immortal? To this last question, Revelation answers, No. We may or may not be *destroyed*. Popular Christianity, however, has erroneously deduced the conclusion, following on the false premise that a resurrection necessarily involves immortality—that "the overwhelming majority of that innumerable multitude of men who have existed in the past, and who exist in the present, will after this life is ended, pass into a state of endless existence in never-ending misery; for this is the meaning which is popularly attached to the word 'damnation?'" (p. 2). It may be almost said that the whole book is devoted to a refutation of this popular doctrine. It is inconsistent with the character of God: so the author proves that the words justice, holiness, mercy, love, benevolence, etc., cannot but have the same meaning whether applied to man or God; though these traits while ever imperfect in man, are absolutely perfect in God alone, and that as manifested in His Son Jesus Christ, we now recognise them as attributes of the Father. Consequently the popular idea of damnation as being a consequence not only of wilful persistence in sin, but as a result of ignorance or "original sin" involves a hideous travesty of justice and mercy, coupled with the most odious caprice conceivable. Although inequalities of all sorts surround man in this world, Christian faith believes that "He has appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness."

Chapter IV. enters on a discussion of the preliminary questions, so far as reason independent of a revelation can answer them. Putting aside all metaphysical speculations as useless, Mr. Row considers four reasons only as worthy of consideration, viz. (1) "The all but universal belief of mankind in a state of existence after death;" (2) "The argument from the greatness of man's intellectual and moral powers, and the imperfect scope that this life affords for their exercise and development;" (3) "The survival of the intellectual and moral powers in their full vigour up to a brief interval before death;" (4) "The moral argument." With regard to these, it may be briefly observed that No. 1 is "suggested by the constitution of man." No. 2 "rests on the assumption that there is a Creator of the universe, who is all-powerful and all-wise. It, therefore, follows that death cannot be the termination of man's existence, but that it is a removal into a sphere of activity different from the present, where his powers will find a sphere fitted for that development which has been denied him here."

THE Convocation of the Northern Province has been further prorogued till the 22nd inst.

* "Future Retribution, viewed in the Light of Reason and Revelation." By C. A. Row, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral. Isbister, London.

With regard to No. 3, science has discovered nothing both as to the nature of life, nor as to how its powers are linked with bodily structure; "this being so, it is impossible to prove that death is the destruction of our personality" (p. 71), . . . or "that man is incapable of existing, thinking, and acting under other conditions than the present ones" (p. 72). The 4th argument "rests on the assumption that there is a God, who is not only the Creator of the Universe, but who is also its moral Governor," and "it is incredible that His moral government should be so conducted that a career of successful villainy should be a more prudent course to pursue than one of virtue and self-sacrifice, which it undoubtedly would be, in very numerous cases, if man perished at death" (p. 73).

In concluding this chapter, the author observes that none of these four reasons are adequate to prove the immortality of man; but only to substantiate the fact that his personality will survive the dissolution of the body. This is a most important question, namely, that man's immortality is distinct from his personal survival at death; a distinction lost sight of in popular theology in which it is commonly conceived that if the righteous will continue to exist in happiness, the wicked *must* also be in misery for evermore, but the premises will not justify this conclusion. The fate of the wicked is discussed later on.

After devoting Chapter V. to a consideration of "The imperfection of the light which the scriptures of the Old Testament throw on the condition of man after death," the author considers more fully "The current theories respecting retribution in contrast with the affirmations of reason and revelation respecting the divine character and perfections;" and he shows conclusively that "every theory . . . which is not based on the principles of eternal justice, and not in conformity with any conception we can form of God's holiness, mercy and love, as revealed in Jesus Christ, is a misrepresentation of the principles on which He will execute judgment hereafter" (p. 138).

The popular idea of God's "scheme of redemption," takes its rise from the account of the fall of man, as given in Genesis iii. He shows that it cannot be a strictly historical account, and even if it were—"the various widespread popular theories respecting the condition in which man was originally created, the nature of his fall, and the consequences which have resulted from it, must be first read into the narrative before they can be found therein, and that it is impossible on anything which it contains to erect a theory respecting the final destinies of mankind, or the nature of the life which awaits them beyond the grave" (p. 165).

We now pass to the New Testament, and the author considers in the eighth chapter "The general positions of the New Testament respecting a future state." The first and most obvious contrast between the two Testaments lies in the teaching respecting the survival of man. "In the one this world is viewed as the region of life and joy, and Hades and death as that of darkness and of gloom. All this in the other is reversed; death loses its terrors, Hades has ceased to be the land of darkness, and to those who die in the faith of Christ, to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord" (p. 167).

Now the New Testament sets forth the survival of man's conscious personality after death under two aspects. First, that our conscious personality will survive the death of our bodies; secondly, that at some period of the future it will once more manifest

itself in some form of bodily, *i.e.* material organisation. . . of a different order and character, which in the case of the holy will be fitted for the exercise of the higher, *i.e.* the rational, spiritual and moral activities of man, and in which the lower or animal propensities will become extinct (p. 177).

Mr. Row next discusses the scriptural teaching regarding the resurrection body. There are four principal statements. 1. Our Lord affirms that there will be no marriages; *i.e.*, our animal nature will cease to exist; 2. St. Paul informs us that at the resurrection, the body of our humiliation will be fashioned anew, and be conformed to the body of Christ's glory; 3. While the New Testament implies that our resurrection bodies will in some way be connected with our present bodies, it nowhere affirms that they will consist of the same numerical particles; 4. Our bodies will be fitted to their environment, *e.g.*, (1) They will not be subject to decay or corruption; (2) There will be no waste and consequently no renewal; (3) They will be strong and fitted for the powerful activities of our spiritual, intellectual, and moral being; (4) Our present bodies being animal (*ψυχικά*) connected with the lower order of creation, our resurrection bodies being spiritual (*πνευματικά*) will connect us with the higher.

Chapter IX. is an important one, and deals with the terminology or the meaning of the language, employed by the writers of the New Testament respecting future retribution. Thus, with regard to *πνεῦμα*, *ψυχή*, *σῶμα*, usually translated spirit, soul, and body, he shows the first two are frequently used interchangeably to denote one and the same thing, namely, everything in man which distinguishes him from a mere animal, *αἰὼν*, *αἰώνιος* and *κόσμος* are treated exhaustively; and the popular mistakes as to the use of the word "everlasting" is clearly exposed. The words signify "age" and "age-long," and of whatever duration never imply more than terminable periods. "They are used with great indefiniteness of meaning, ranging from the remote period of the future, when the Son shall deliver up the Messianic kingdom to the Father, to a temporal judgment which is permanent in its effects, and periods intermediate between them" (p. 217). *Ζωή* (Life) and *θάνατος* (Death). The author shows that Life and Death in the various senses in which they may be used in ordinary English have their exact counterparts in Greek; and that "it was impossible that the word 'death' could have been used by the Greeks or understood by those to whom they wrote, in a technical sense, denoting a condition of endless existence in never-ending misery" (p. 227). The following and kindred terms are next considered: *Ἀπόλεια*, *ἀπόλλυμι*, *ἄλεθρος*, *διαφθείρω*, etc. They all embrace the idea of *destruction*, while *αἰώνιος ἄλεθρος* cannot mean eternal punishment of an immortal being, but a *destruction which would be final and complete*. This subject is further considered in the eleventh chapter, in reference to St. John's Gospel (p. 272).

We now pass to the consideration of the teaching of the synoptic Gospels, and of the Acts of the Apostles respecting the nature of future retribution. "The teaching of the Gospels is uniformly associated with the great idea which interpenetrates them, *viz.*, that of the kingdom of heaven. . . yet, strange to say, although this forms their subject-matter, and that of the teaching of our Lord Himself, the idea of the kingdom of God scarcely finds any place in either systematic or popular theology, but in its place has been substituted a number of abstract dogmas as constituting the

essence of Christianity." (pp. 236, 237). It is important to observe that the kingdom of God or the Church embraces two ages, the present dispensation in which evil is mixed with good, and the future one when evil shall have been gathered out of it. In Eph. i. 17-23, the Apostle uses the words "not only in this age, but also in that which is to come," which Mr. Row shows "must have been intended by the Apostle to refer to the present Christian dispensation, or the period of the Church's growth, and the age which is to come, refers to the kingdom of Christ in its glorious manifestation" (p. 239).

Retribution and eternal life and its equivalent expressions are correlated, and the author shows from a number of passages carefully analysed, that "the terms used to describe the future punishment of men irrecoverably wicked, affirm that it will be some awful form of destruction; and that in the final judgment pronounced on each individual, will be in accordance with the prophecy that God hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness" (p. 270).

After analysing every passage dealing with retribution in the Epistles and the Apocalypse, the author arrives at the same conclusion as from a study of the Gospels: "The final destiny (of the wicked) is denoted by the word 'destruction,' or some other of kindred meaning. . . . All, therefore, that reason and revelation affirm is that man will survive the stroke of death as long as it is necessary in order that the apparent imperfections of God's present moral government may receive a perfect vindication in a world to come; and although the promise of everlasting life is in the New Testament made to the holy, no declaration can be found therein which affirms that evil beings will continue to exist for ever, or that those in whom all good has become extinct are incapable of being destroyed by sin in a manner analogous to that in which physical diseases in the course of God's ordinary providence destroy the body, nor has reason anything to say to the contrary" (p. 346).

In the 13th chapter, the author asks the question "Does human probation terminate at death?" After showing that Jesus represented the Character of God both in its loving and merciful aspects, as well as in the sterner features of justice; and inferring from many passages, as *e.g.* the statement of our Lord that the patriarchs had not perished at death by the words "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, I am not a God of the dead but of the living," and from St. Peter's statement that Jesus proclaimed glad tidings to the spirits of the Antediluvians in Hades, he says, "we are justified in inferring that some opportunity of embracing His gospel will be afforded to those innumerable multitudes of mankind, whose earthly probation has been passed under unfavourable conditions" (p. 379).

Chapter XIV. is devoted to a criticism of the validity of the theories of universalism, and of conditional immortality; while chapter XV. and last, is a summary of the results of the previous arguments. The chief point worth recalling is that if a man's conscious personality survive death, it does not logically follow that he will be immortal. The wide-spread belief that it does, involves the idea that the wicked who arise from the dead, must live for ever in torments; so that "the doctrine of inherent immortality of the soul is supposed to carry along with it, as a necessary consequence, that evil spirits and evil men

must continue to exist for ever in torments which will never terminate" (p. 409). "In appealing to men's hopes and fears, the writers of the New Testament do not rest their appeal on what is commonly called 'the doctrine of the immortality of the soul,' but on a future resurrection, which is to take place at the coming of the Lord in triumphant glory. It is then, they affirm, that God will render to every man according to his works." Another point worth emphasising is that the Greek word *αἰών* never means "endlessness," and however long the "age" may be, a time must come when it will end; and that the writers of the New Testament were always concerned with the periods of the Messianic kingdom, very long, it may be, before Christ shall give up the kingdom to God, who will then be all in all; but as to the subsequent period passing off into absolute eternity, or "endlessness," they appear to have known nothing; as the vision of the apostolic writers did not penetrate into it, their knowledge was confined to the *αἰώνιος βασιλεία* that is "the age-long kingdom" of our Lord Jesus Christ, age-long in this connection being a term exactly equivalent in meaning to the Greek *αἰώνας*.

I have now given an outline of the main features of this important book, which our clergy would do well to study, so as to be able to bring forward in a concise form strictly logical proofs and unanswerable arguments in support of a general resurrection, of the survival at death of conscious personality, of a judgment in righteousness and continued life of the holy, of a subsequent period of probation of the unfortunate in this world; and last, but not least, the *destruction*, or annihilation, probably with some great suffering, of the utterly impenitent. This last fact destroys the popular but erroneous doctrine of eternal punishment, which is supposed to consist of never-ending misery endured by an immortal soul.

GEORGE HENSLOW.

ARCHDEACON PHILLPOTTS is lying dangerously ill at St. Gluvias Vicarage, Penryn.

THE donor of the house referred to in the Bishop of Rochester's address at his diocesan conference last week is Mr. Alexander Macmillan, the well-known publisher. He has offered the Bishop his house and grounds, Knapdale, Upper Tooting, as a residence for the future Suffragan, and the gift has been gratefully accepted, subject to the passing of the Act which is to found the new bishopric. Knapdale is a large and commodious house of the type which is still not uncommon in the older suburbs of London, and it is surrounded by a charming garden. It is said that the only condition imposed by Mr. Macmillan in handing over the freehold to the Bishop, is that the house shall remain as far as possible as it is at present. In every way, as regards both situation and internal arrangement, Knapdale is admirably adapted for the residence of a Bishop of South London.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
 and all **Pulmonary**
 Affections can be
 immediately re-
 lieved and rapidly
CURED
 by simply
 using
 the

AMMONIAPHONE

FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.

21s. post free.
 WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by
 the Royal Family, and principal
 Physicians, Clergymen,
 Vocalists, and Public Speakers
 throughout the country. New illus-
 trated Pamphlet with copies of Thou-
 sands of Testimonials
 may be had
 on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
 Corner of Rabbittone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1888.

THE PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD.

THE announcement of the coming Pan-Anglican Synod, has already brought to our shores Bishops from distant parts of the world; every week adds to their number, and therefore in the month of July, we may expect to see a large influx of prelates to discuss in solemn synod certain questions which will interest and ultimately affect the Church at large, and upon which it is therefore necessary that the voice of our ecclesiastical rulers should be heard.

It is a long time since the first Pan-Anglican Synod met, many, however, will remember the time when Archbishop Longley, decided upon this plan of bringing together the various members of the episcopate for consultation and prayer, some doubted the wisdom of the step which was then taken, but after events seem to have justified the action. At that time, however, although the Church was distracted by the Colenso controversy the subject was not discussed by the Synod. What a change has taken place since then! Dr. Colenso has passed away, and so has Bishop Gray, the metropolitan of South Africa, who deposed him. But although there is no such bitter controversy raging now, the questions to be discussed at the ensuing Conference or Synod, seem to us of extreme importance. The first subject on the list is: The Church's practical work in relation to, (a) Intemperance, (b) Purity, (c) Care of Emigrants, (d) Socialism. Under the first heading, we presume that something will be said on the subject of that habit, practised by some Englishmen, of giving alcoholic liquors to

the native races—a habit which is said to be most disastrous in its effects. We are glad to know that the question is going to be discussed, for while drinking customs are rapidly decreasing, and there is less intoxicating drink consumed than was formerly the case, we are told that in Australia the custom of "shouting" still prevails very strongly. "Shouting" is the habit of one person after another offering to pay for drink for those assembled in the bar or tap-room, a practice which we can remember the Bishop of North Queensland condemning very strongly. The next question, that of Purity, is a very difficult one to deal with, and we shall await with interest the decision of the Synod. The evil of impurity is great we all know, but it is not lessened by the publication of certain books and pamphlets on the subject, and many of these books deserve no better fate than to be consigned to utter oblivion. Socialism is another subject to be discussed, and as many of the Bishops are living in countries where there is no system of landed proprietors such as exists in England, in countries, too, where the soil is free—nay more, where social distinctions are very often completely obliterated—it will be extremely interesting to know what are their opinions on this much-vexed question, and how far they accord with Socialists proper, on one hand, and the so-called Christian Socialists on the other. That good is likely to come out of this discussion rather than evil, we infer from the interesting speeches at the Wolverhampton Church Congress, when each of the prominent Socialists, Mr. Champion among the number, had their say.

The third subject set down for discussion will also be of much interest, viz., the Anglican Communion in relation to the Eastern churches, to the Scandinavian, and other Reformed churches, to the old Catholics and others. The Archbishop of Canterbury has sent out a mission to the Christians in Kurdistan and the East, and there is also the further question as to how far intercommunion is to be promoted with the Holy Eastern—otherwise known as the Greek Church, that there are points of agreement between them and us all admit, on the other side, there is the rejection of the "Filioque," which has caused a division, and the use of pictures and icons in their churches; fraternal letters have been addressed to the Metropolitan of the various Eastern Churches from time to time by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and cordially received, and some seem to think that it is only a question of time for a closer union to take place between the Eastern and Western Churches. With regard to the Scandinavian, Swedish, and other Churches, it will be very helpful to know how far we are to regard them as National Churches, and as being branches of the Church Catholic. The old Catholics are certainly drawn to us, and at the close of last year the Bishops of Lichfield and Salisbury made

tour of inspection to the old Catholics with a view to the discussion at the ensuing Synod. There is one other subject of importance which will give rise to considerable discussion, and that is Polygamy among heathen converts. This is obviously a very difficult question, and has sorely exercised the minds of missionaries for some time. Are they to enforce the giving up of wives before converts can be admitted to holy baptism or not? If they are to have more wives than one, what is to be the limit? Polygamy was discussed very keenly at the Wakefield Church Congress, and there two bishops were opposed to each other—viz., the Bishop of Exeter on the one side, and the Bishop of Zululand on the other. There was only one thing to be said, the Bishop of Zululand had had practical experience of the work, and had seen the evils of Polygamy, which the Bishop in England had not. At any rate it is to be hoped that some wise decision will be arrived at, and accepted by all. The spectacle of Bishops coming from all parts of the world—from East and West, North and South—is very inspiring; and when we contemplate the state of missionary enterprise thirty years ago and what it is at the present time, we may thank God and take courage. Of the Church of England it may be said, “God is in the midst of Her, therefore shall she not be removed.”



EDITORIAL.

IN our present issue we fulfil our promise in placing before our readers the first part of a paper entitled “Recollections of a Parish Priest.” The paper was written by a member of his congregation, and dates back just fifty years. Prone as men are to look back with a sort of contempt on the clerics of that period, it must be both refreshing and strengthening to us, to see that even fifty years ago there were men who had the same earnest spirituality as the ideal “parish priest of the present day.” The record is admitted to be in every way a correct one, and fulfils the conditions of a memoir without being a eulogy.



IT is our intention to send a free copy of the PULPIT to every clergyman, beneficed or unbeneficed, whose names appear in the “Clergy List” for the year, and who are not already subscribers. Should any of our readers, however, know of any clergyman to whom our publication might be useful, we shall be pleased to supply a copy direct to the address sent to us, at the earliest opportunity.



OWING to the reduction in price of the PULPIT, we again call the attention of our readers to the fact, and point out that the future of this paper must, in a great measure, depend upon the energy and zeal of our present readers, in prevailing upon their friends to become subscribers.

RECOLLECTIONS OF A PARISH PRIEST.

IT was my great privilege to be acquainted with a parish priest whose character may be said to have completely realized the idea we are apt to form of that honourable and useful class; and having had abundant opportunities of observing him under a great diversity of aspects, I trust that a sketch of him, though perchance very imperfect, may not be without its uses. The influence of such men should not be limited to the narrow sphere in which they minister. However, I am not so fond as to imagine that such a character is alone *sui generis*: there are very many such, I doubt not, within the precincts of our pure and scriptural Church, who expect no reward in this world beyond an approving conscience: their steadfast vision is fixed on things beyond the bounds of time and sense. I thank God for it: may the number be greatly increased in these trying times of the Church and the world!

It will be necessary to premise that his standing in the University in which he graduated, proved that he had largely profited in the learning there taught. His first-rate scholarship, in conjunction with an unspotted character, caused a lucrative and honourable post to be assigned him in his college—a post of worthy ambition to good scholars—which he doubtless might have retained much longer, had he been so minded. But no: he felt himself called on to exercise his talents in a more important field, but one withal, which ordinarily possesses but few attractions for the scholar and the gentleman. He undertook the charge of a poor and populous parish, the income of which perhaps only sufficed to pay his curate, and furnish his amount of support to the different charities set on foot for the benefit of the poor.

The entire parish was of great extent, and the church being both small and inconveniently situated for the greater portion of the inhabitants, he, by his liberal example and unwearied exertions, caused two new and commodious churches to be erected. In a district assigned to one of these it was that he laboured constantly for several years, not only in the more sacred duties of his office, but in obtaining a sound and religious education for the less affluent of his people. In furtherance of this object he caused a noble school to be erected for daily instruction, well furnished with all the appliances requisite for its efficiency. And that no child in his parish should be denied the opportunity of becoming acquainted with those things that concern his eternal welfare, the Sunday-schools challenged a large share of his time and attention. By procuring for the former a competent master and mistress, and by meeting the teachers of the latter at stated periods, to discuss the reading lessons for the Lord's day, and to assist them by pointing out the most suitable methods of setting the subject before the children, the schools became very efficient instruments in disseminating much secular and religious knowledge.

The meetings of the Sunday-school teachers, so admirably conducted, were such a strong bond of union as can be scarcely overrated. It was on these occasions that our pastor's character came out in all its loveliness. In reading with the teachers and questioning them he took the greatest pains (though in the most unaffected manner) that no one should ever feel a sense of humiliation owing to his deficiency of knowledge, or his inaptitude in answering. In case the

answer was not ready, he would insinuate the necessary information himself, and that mostly in the shape of a query, as though he were merely clothing with words the ideas already in the mind of the questionist. The method of instruction by question and answer was very effective method of bringing out the mind of the teachers, and has an evident advantage over the dogmatic form used in addressing a mixed congregation. Moreover, he never challenged the superiority to which his relative position might have entitled him : he assumed all present to be on the same level, and solicited their opinions, and paid the utmost deference to their suggestions for promoting the greater efficiency of the schools. By this Christian temper and delicate tact he effectually secured the hearty co-operation of a useful body of teachers. In truth, there was habitually such a holy calm pervading these meetings, a "sweet taking of counsel together," that many would compare the period of breaking up with the "descent from the mount." They felt "it was good to be there." Occasionally he would impress on the minds of those present the importance of the duties they had undertaken, and the consequent necessity of due preparation for the task, and how that after having secured the regards of their scholars by kind and considerate treatment, they should vary their instruction according to the tempers and capacities of the individual children composing their respective classes. He uniformly contended that corporal punishment should never be inflicted in a Sunday-school ; and viewing the large numbers attending his schools, the discipline was very efficient, and seldom was any one dismissed as irreclaimable.

To test the progress of the scholars it was his practice to catechise a class of boys and girls alternately on the Sunday afternoons, after the reading of the Second Lesson ; and as the children were required to frame their own answers, it ensured a tolerably competent knowledge of the subject selected ; this being given out a fortnight beforehand for their study. He felt the solemn conviction that the souls of every one in his district were committed to him ; therefore, in visiting the poor at their own houses, it was his constant practice earnestly to solicit the attendance of those children who from various causes could not avail themselves of the National School.

Under the head of schools must not be omitted the mention of a very commodious and complete Infant-school, otherwise rebuilt during his incumbency, and which formed a sort of nursery for the National Schools. Early instruction was a prime object with this good man, because he daily experienced the great difficulty of producing any virtuous impressions on the minds of those who had been allowed to arrive at maturity in total neglect of their best interests.

In the ardent prosecution of these objects he was no visionary or enthusiast ; he always carefully adjusted the means to the end : his was a thoroughly practical mind. Though he constantly implored assistance from on high, and always knew and acknowledged that "except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it," yet he never slackened his exertions—he wrought as unremittingly as though the issue were entirely under his own control. And he was not disappointed : the results were most cheering and consoling to himself as well as to his pious parishioners.

Though, as before intimated, he was an excellent scholar, his sermons were on a level with the capacity of his people—there was nothing in them to gratify the

"itching ear ;" no flights of fancy, no tropes : they were plain, but never mean or familiar. His doctrinal discourses embraced the fundamental truths of the Gospel as authoritatively set down and elucidated in the Homilies, Liturgy, and Articles of our pure Apostolic Church. Moreover, they had an important practical bearing : on no occasion were the people allowed to quit the church without a solemn and searching application of the subject to their consciences. The hypocrite or self-deceiver could not repose under his ministry. In these portions of his sermons he was so earnest that no one could doubt but that his own mind was deeply impressed—I had almost said oppressed—with the vast importance of the subject he was discussing.

He, in his measure, knew what was in the heart of man. He felt that mere preceptive preaching effected but little good. Right principles are the source of a right life : it is the love of Christ alone constraineth us. "If ye love me, keep my commandments : " a solemn appeal, most surely responded to by every one worthy to be named after his divine Master. Therefore it was that he set forth the love of his Saviour as the constraining motive to righteousness of life. He had himself tasted that the Lord was gracious, and therefore it was with the utmost confidence that he invited his fellow-sinners to make trial of His goodness. Another (negative) characteristic of his preaching was, that he seldom delivered a controversial sermon. He wisely considered that such preaching turns aside the minds of his hearers from the proper ends of public worship, and if allowed to occupy a prominent place in the ministry of the Word, engenders pride and fosters unholy tempers. Unfortunately, controversial divinity is, with certain classes of religious people, a substitute for practical piety and spiritual worship. They can discuss with much facility the "five points," but, alas ! forget the duty of love to the brethren, and of striving after conformity to their great Exemplar. This error, I say, he avoided. Occasionally, it is true, he exposed the erroneous doctrines and idolatrous worship of the Papists ; but even this was defensive : it was provoked in the main by their aggressions on his flock—by the unequivocal exhibition of that proselytizing spirit which has always characterized that body. It will not be impertinent to state, that that cardinal doctrine of Holy Scripture, justification by faith, brought out with such vivid clearness in the disputations consequent on the overthrow of the Papal errors and Papal power, formed a prominent feature in his preaching. How can it be otherwise with one who knows how "rightly to divide the work of truth" ? Mr. Trench, in his work on the Miracles, sets forth this in a few words : "God's justification of a sinner is not merely a word spoken about a man, but a word spoken to him, and in him." It may be profitable to contrast this scriptural view with the Romish doctrine of an *opus operatum*.

Having thus indicated his fidelity, I would only add further, as a broad principle, touching his doctrinal sentiments, that he seemed to bear ever in mind the solemn persuasion he avowed at his ordering as a priest, "that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required of necessity for eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ," and also evinced his determination "to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which he was persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture." So likewise was he, according to

is promise, "diligent in prayers and reading the holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same." I need hardly say, after the above statement, that he did not participate in the movement towards Rome, which has created so much uneasiness in the minds of Churchmen in recent times.

In the conduct of public worship he was extremely devout and earnest, and the same spirit seemed to have been caught by his people. God alone knoweth the heart, but it is undeniable that a more apparently devout and solemn congregation than this good man's never from time to time assembled, and this, as it well might be, was no small comfort and encouragement to their pastor.

It is known that a great deal of misapprehension prevails in our congregations touching the receiving of the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. An undue fear of the unworthy receiving thereof deters many pious worshippers from frequenting that high and excellent means of grace. Therefore it was, that he often referred to the subject, and endeavoured to set the matter in a proper light, according to the meaning of its original institution by our Lord himself, in order that no humble-minded worshipper might be repelled by unfounded scruples, at the same time that no mere formalist should be encouraged to the desecration of that great mystery, and so bring condemnation on himself. This sacrament is more especially needed by the weak in faith, by the "new-born babes," as a means, under God's blessing, of strengthening their faith, and of assuring them of God's acceptance of them through Christ, whose love to his disciples is so plainly set forth therein, and whose gracious invitation is so irresistible to those who will be induced to solemnly ponder our beautiful Communion Service; fraught as it is with unsurpassed tenderness and persuasiveness to an ingenuous mind.

It was his practice, for he never stinted his labour, to meet the communicants a day or two before the administration of the Sacrament for a familiar exposition of some Scriptural subject, and fervent prayer for Divine grace on the forthcoming services; and it should be stated that the number of communicants bore a large proportion to the entire congregation; nor am I aware that any one disgraced by notorious backsliding the solemn profession then made of his dedication to God's service, and intention to "lead a new life."

In his every-day walk he held forth a bright and consistent example of how a Christian should deport himself in the world—in it, not of it—grave, without moroseness—solemn, without pomposity. He well knew—no one better—that wordy zeal in God's service is of little avail in priest or people. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." We must do, to show what we are; and conversely, what we are gives rise to what we do. Remembering St. Paul's exhortation to Timothy, "Be instant in season, out of season," he never shrunk from any demand on his time or labour, or suffered the indulgence of ease to interfere with the call of duty. And none but a clergyman so situated can estimate the amount of self-denial which a faithful adherence to this principle necessarily involves.

In truth, this devoutly-minded man was a living epistle, "known and read of all men." He did not bear himself as a "lord over God's heritage;" he not only showed himself "gentle and merciful for Christ's

sake to poor and needy people," but exhibited the same kindness of manner and affectionate solicitude to the more obdurate. Perhaps he considered this unfortunate class were hardened in their vicious courses by seldom or never having heard, before his advent to the parish, the accents of brotherly love and sympathy. And no doubt his judgment was, to a great extent, correct; for who does not know that kindness will almost uniformly soften the hardest heart, and produce a reformation, when the severest punishments have failed? He therefore watched the faintest motion of return to the path of rectitude, in order to fan the feeble desire into a flame, he yearned over the sinner, and his ardent charity caused him to "believe all things, and hope all things." An important principle with him was, never to despair of any one, and the more forward only called forth greater pains and more varied means to reach their case.

Let no one flatter himself that he has attained to the virtue of Christian love, if that love is limited to the pious and amiable: it must reach beyond this. "It is an easy thing to hate evil men," says St. Austin, "because they are evil; but to love them as they are men, this is a rare and a pious thing." "A rare thing," that is, excellent, we take it. Now he of whom we are speaking, it will be perceived, had attained to this high standard, short of which none should rest satisfied.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

JACOB'S FRAUD.

SIR,—Mr. Murphy's letter in your number of Saturday, May, 26th, on "Jacob's fraud," is more satisfactory than his first, because he gives a reason for rejecting the account of the affair contained in Genesis. His first letter said merely that he disbelieved that account. As the story is very like many old traditions, and very like some that we find in old historians—the neighing of Darius's horse is of the same kind—to say nothing more than that one does not accept it does not go very far in the analysis. I am going to offer a view of the morality of the history, not, I believe, contrary to Mr. Murphy's principle and moral sentiment, although my conclusion is not the same as his.

He objects that it is impossible that God should have not only permitted, but also blessed, sanctioned, and rewarded the fraud. We must understand what the sanction consisted in. In the education of the human race in religion and in morals, as in the education of the individual, the first religious sentiment to be evoked is that of reverence—faith; and the first moral principle is truthfulness, the observance of promises. God is a God who heareth prayer. The blessing of Isaac upon his son was a prayer; a prayer to which an efficacy was attached by the religious sentiment of the time, as though the utterance of the prayer did actually insure its own fulfilment; seeing that God had virtually promised, or was esteemed to have virtually promised, that He would have regard to such prayers. Here there are united the primary religious sentiment and the primary moral principle.

But the blessing—the prophecy and promise of greatness—was obtained by fraud. To us of the nine-

teenth century of the Christian era, it is quite as elementary that fraud vitiates a contract, as that a contract ought to be observed. But to the children in intellect of nineteen centuries before Christ, it is no mere speculation to say, that this cannot have been so evident. A maxim that limits another maxim, although both of them are founded on the same ultimate ground, must of necessity be posterior in evolution to the first maxim. I am of the belief that so it was in the education of the human race; it is certain that it is so in the education of little children. They do not understand limits and conditions. Say to a child of six, I will give you an apple if you are good; if the child misbehaves, and you mulct him of his reward, he will acknowledge your justice. But say the same to a child of three, and the little innocent will remember the promise while in perfect sincerity it will ignore the condition. It will think itself cheated; and its moral sense may for a long time to come be actually blunted through a sense of injustice, by your injudicious and premature enforcement of a condition.

I interpret, then, God's sanction, if Mr. Murphy insists on the word, of Jacob's fraud, as being in reality the observance of God's own promise. A good deal of the analogy of the Scripture affords countenance to such an interpretation. The first covenant was not faultless. "I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live." Our Saviour Christ taught the people as they were able to hear him. Moral evolution, like revelation, comes by degrees. This principle is very wide, and crops up at various stages in history. Two hundred years ago it does not seem to have occurred to anyone that the kidnapping of heathens and their enslavement by Christians was a wrong thing. I think it almost certain that at some period of social infancy, the doctrine that fraud discharges from observance of promises would not have been understood.

All the above does not lie on the surface; but it is not recondite nor far-fetched. The more that I read the Bible, the more convinced I am that the thoughts and the lessons thereof are very deep. But, though deep, the medium through which they are to be read is very clear.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

29th May, 1888.

SIR,—There are circumstances under which discussion, even when invited, becomes inexpedient; and this is especially the case, when it will certainly prove to be unprofitable and useless. No one would discuss the perturbations of the planetary system, or the inequalities of the moon's orbit, with one whose acquaintance with astronomy stopped at the Ptolemaic system, or the theory of eclipses with a believer in the flatness of the earth. And it seems to me equally outside the sphere of utility to discuss delicate questions concerning the progressiveness of revelation, with those to whom Biblical criticism is so much a sealed book that its ordinary language is unintelligible.

I hope, therefore, to be excused for having nothing further to offer to your correspondent, "C. C.," beyond the suggestion, that before denouncing my revolting impiety, and praying that it may be forgiven me, because I mentioned one of the stock Secularist objections to the Bible, for the purpose of showing how it might be answered; it might have been well for him to begin further back, and denounce the Psalmist for writing "There is no God," and St. Paul for giving expression to the immoral maxims, "Let

us do evil that good may come," and "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

With your esteemed correspondent, Mr. Murphy, the case is altogether different. I traversed the statements in his short letter, because I thought that in writing hastily he had missed the precise point, and only needed to have his attention more particularly called to it. I am glad and thankful to find that what I wrote approves itself to his mind. I would only remind him now that it is not my view at all, but only that of the sacred writer (at least implicitly), that God "sanctioned Jacob's fraud by transferring the birthright and blessing to him from Esau." To that view the writer is shut up by his belief, that the success of the fraud was really the efficient cause of God's disinheriting the elder son in favour of the younger. To us, of course, that view is inadmissible; but the writer adopts it without guile or suspicion, not being sufficiently advanced in moral conceptions to perceive the slur that it casts upon the divine character. He thinks to explain historically how, ages before his time, the blessing had been diverted to the younger line: St. Paul, with truer insight, takes no account of the historical incident, but ascribes the change in the devolution of the blessing to the eternal purpose and foreknowledge of God.

PRESBYTER.

ROBERT ELSMERE.

SIR,—I suppose Mr. Gladstone's article in the *Nineteenth Century* for this month must have awakened deep interest in the minds of the Christian readers. He tells us that "in the circles of literature and science there is a strong anti-dogmatic leaning," also that "the instances of good and devoted men, who are averse to dogma, are more frequent than usual in this age." He makes no attempt to explain the problem, but he shows in eloquent, impressive and reverential terms, that the elimination of the miraculous element from the Gospels would in no degree repress or impair the evidences for the Divinity of our Lord.

I became a contributor to the PULPIT soon after I was informed by the late Rev. Archer Gurney that it admitted arguments on both sides on important questions. I hope that feature of its constitution may still be continued, within the bounds of reverence, and temperate language. As Englishmen have been particularly distinguished for professing a love of freedom, it might be well if they were more willing than they are in our day to listen to those who differ from them in opinions on vital questions, whether political, social, or religious.

Mr. Gladstone says that the aim of the book he criticises is to discard "the supposed lumber of the Christian theology." I feel persuaded that the term "lumber" does not include the elevating and consolatory declaration, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." Nor does it include the principle of retribution, or a severe code for the punishment of sin. But there is a growing desire which has been implanted and fostered by the precepts of the New Testament, that the infliction of penalties should not only seek to protect and promote the general welfare, and to satisfy the claims of justice, but likewise to work out the reformation of the delinquent, in combination with measures of instruction and enlightenment, dictated by kindly solicitude.

As there are great differences of opinion among "English Churchmen" in our day, and none of us profess to recognise any infallible authority as to what is "sound scripture truth," I trust these remarks may not be found inconsistent with the declared aims and objects of the PULPIT. JOHN BARNES.

Canonbury, 26th May, 1888.

[THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT will continue to admit arguments on both sides of important religious questions, but will not give up its limited space to supporting "hobbies."—ED.]

"ST. JOHN: THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL."

SIR,—I have only just received the current PULPIT, and I hasten to apologise to my "ancient antagonist" for the great injustice of supposing him capable of so one-sided a review, as that on my work on "St. John." The blame, however, must rest on the rotten system of anonymous reviewing. Of all indefinite pronouns, the literary "we" is the most indefinite. One never knows what is the reality of the muffled figure that so vigorously beats the air. Owing to this system Professor Huxley, speaking in 3½ columns of the *Times*, was enabled to give the first start to the false theory of evolution, by praising and puffing Darwin's "Origin of Species"—much to Darwin's own astonishment.

I withdraw the word *animus*, but the *bias* remains; and while not disputing your reviewer's *eminence*, I do not hesitate to stigmatise his notice as distinctly *unfair*, and designed to create a prejudice against my works. This, it need scarcely be said, is wholly unworthy of a "judicial scholar" and an impartial reviewer. Kindly insert this if possible in your next issue. I have no time now for more.

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 28th, 1888.

CHRIST IN HEAVEN.

(See Rev. i. 18, and Ps. lxxvii. 16, 20.)

THOU who wast dead and livest evermore,
And hast the keys of Hades and of death;—
Who givest and who takest life and breath;—
O Thou who standest on the eternal shore,
Beyond the flow of time, beyond the roar
Of change and toil and tumult!—Lord, we know
The heart of love that dwelt in Thee below
Still dwells in Thee, whom Seraphim adore.
And though Thy ways are in the mighty deep,
And though Thy footsteps are by paths unknown,
Thou wilt Thine earthly flock in safety keep,
And lead and guard and guide it for Thine own;
Thou, Heavenly King, art Shepherd of Thy sheep,
And Thou wilt gather all around Thy throne.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barnard, Rev. C. W., Rector of Rowley; Rector of Churchill, Kidderminster.
Eennett, Rev. J., D.D., late Incumbent of Park Chapel, Chelsea; Vicar of St. George's, Worthing.
Bond, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Licensed Preacher within the Diocese of Manchester.
Burnside, Rev. Francis, Curate of Chipping Campden; Vicar of Much Birch, Kashleigh, Herefordshire.

Butler, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of St. Michael's, Coventry; Vicar of Neasden-cum-Kingsbury.
Chettoe, Rev. Samuel Edward, B.A., Licensed to Officiate in St. Gabriel's Chapel-of-Ease, Newington.
Cook, Rev. Thomas Henry, Rector of Frinton.
Edwards, Rev. James, Perpetual Curate of Leebootwood-with-Longnor, Shrewsbury.
Gibbons, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Gregory's, Canterbury; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Worcestershire.
Harrison, Rev. F. T., M.A., Second Master of Weymouth College; Head Master of Milton Abbas School, Blandford.
Howson, Rev. George John, Rector of Overton, near Chester; Vicar of Crewe.
Hume, Rev. H. S., Vicar of Wilton, Taunton; Rector of Staple Fitzpaine.
Hurst, Rev. Robert, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Macclesfield.
Jones, Rev. William, Curate of Selattyn, Pontfadog, Llangollen.
Mahoney, Rev. Patrick R., Chaplain of the Tailors' Benevolent Institution, Haverstock Hill.
Marshall, Rev. Walter, B.A., Minor Canon in St. George's Chapel, Windsor.
Meynell, Rev. Henry, M.A., late Vicar of Denston; Rural Dean of Cheadle, Staffordshire.
Moore, Rev. Gilbert, formerly Curate of St. Augustine's, Kilburn; Incumbent of St. Andrew's, Worthing.
Morgan, Rev. Edward, B.A., Curate of St. Andrew's, Cardiff; Vicar of Llanishen-with-Lisvane, Glamorganshire.
Palmer, Rev. Abram Smythe, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Hermon Hill.
Peason, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Nottingham; Perpetual Curate of St. Margaret's, Brighton.
Randolph, Rev. Rodney Granville, M.A., Vicar of Willen, Bucks.
Rawlinson, Rev. George, Canon of Canterbury and Camden, Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford; Rector of All Hallows', Lombard Street, London.
Stock, Rev. George H., B.A., Curate of the Parish Church, Sheffield; Vicar of St. Peter's, Middlesborough.
Tayler, Rev. G. R., B.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Silas Byker, Newcastle.
Tuck, Rev. A. J., M.A., Assistant Master of Uppingham; Rector of Great Munden, Herts.
Turner, Rev. R. S., Curate of St. Mark's, New Brompton; Vicar of Tirley, Gloucestershire.
Twells, Rev. Richard Lionel, M.A., Curate of Burnham, Bucks; Vicar of Whaddon, near Cambridge.
Walker, Rev. Frederick George, B.A., Chaplain of the Military College, Cowley, Oxon.
Warner, Rev. J. A., Vicar of Hadlow Down, Sussex.
Willis, Rev. Frederick William, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Wellingborough, Northampton; Rector of Warrington.
Windley, Rev. Thomas Wilson, M.A., Rector of Thorpe, Derbyshire.
Woodall, Rev. T. J., Curate of St. Thomas's, Salisbury; Chaplain to the Infirmary, Salisbury.
Woodhouse, Rev. George Girdlestone, B.A.; Vicar of Yealmp-ton, Devonshire.
Woods, Rev. Francis Henry, B.D., Vicar of St. Peter's, Chalfont, Bucks.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brampton, Rev. John Black, M.A., Clerk in Holy Orders, at 42, Marine Parade, Dover, on the 19th ult., aged 70.
Birkbeck, Professor William Lloyd, Q.C., M.A., the Master of Downing College, and Downing Professor of the Laws of England, Cambridge University, at Downing College, Cambridge, on the 25th ult., aged 82.
Brieknell, Rev. W. S., M.A. Oxon, J.P., for forty-one years Vicar of Eynsham, and fifty years Lecturer of St. Martin's, Oxford, at Eynsham Vicarage, on Whit-Monday, aged 82.
Chawner, Rev. Charles Fox, Rector of Blechingley, at Blechingly Rectory, on the 25th ult. aged 81.
Guyon, Rev. Gardiner Guion, M.A., at 1, Pembroke Villas, Richmond, on the 24th ult.
Hoggan, Rev. Charles Adam, M.A., of Oriel College, Oxford, formerly Rector of Talaton, Devon, at Clifton, Bristol, on the 26th ult.
Holland, Rev. Erskine William, Rector of Dunsfold, at 45, Sillwood Road, Brighton, on the 20th ult., aged 84.



The Church of England Pulpit.

MY BROTHER'S KEEPER.

BY THE REV. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL
ON SUNDAY, APRIL 29TH, 1888.

"And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel, thy brother? and he said, I know not; am I my brother's keeper?"—GENESIS iv. 9.

THIS is the earliest utterance which expresses the relation of indifference or hostility between man and man which was one of the results of the disobedience of our first parents. As St. Paul says tersely, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Most assuredly they were sinners against God, sinners against their fellow-men. Adam could not transmit that robe of righteousness which had been at the first superadded to his natural endowments, and which was forfeited by his sin. And this man, left to the purely animal instinct of uncontrolled and unaided nature, became estranged, not only from God, but also from his brother man. As his higher intelligence was obscured, so his affections were contracted. He shrank back into himself. He lived, he worked, he thought, for himself; and self-preservation and self-assertion absorbed all the energies which were due, first, to the honour of his Maker, and then to the care of and consideration for his brethren. Had Adam never fallen, we may certainly presume that the human family might have multiplied indefinitely, while all its members would still have been united by the bonds of an unchanging affection. But the withdrawal of supernatural grace at the Fall meant the impetuous insurgence of selfish passion, and the blood of Abel and the question of Cain marked the new relations of enmity and of indifference between man and man which were its first results.

"Am I my brother's keeper?" This question, first asked over the bleeding corpse of Abel, accurately represents the general spirit of the old heathen world. In that world, notwithstanding its abundant and varied interest, one thing is clear: every nation, every tribe, every class lived for itself. Every man was, at heart, more or less consciously, the rival, if not the enemy, of some other man. There was no real bond in the ancient world to keep men together. A tribe or a nation had a certain coherence imposed upon it

by self-interest or by force. With the outside world it had no relations based on a higher sense of duty or affection. Even religion, which should traverse the divisions among human beings, and which by knowledge and love of a common Father in heaven should unite those who are divided by race or by prejudice—even religion, when its creed had degenerated into polytheism, only accentuated the deep divisions of the human family. Every country, or nearly every country, had its own religion, just as it had its own laws and language and polity and customs. Its religion was a part of the national furniture, and a local or national god was not to be held responsible for anything—if, indeed, he was powerful to do anything—beyond the frontiers of the people who worshipped him. It will be in your recollections that, after the great defeat of the Syrians, the advisers of the Syrian king Ben-Hadad, urged that, if only an engagement with the forces of Israel could be brought on in the plain, it would be probably successful, since they imagined that the power of the God of Israel was strictly confined, for political reasons, to the hills; and it was this difficulty of conceiving of a Deity who had more than a local or national sway which led the heathen philosopher, Celsus, to say that a man must be mad who could suppose that Greeks and barbarians, that Europeans and Asiatics and Africans, could ever be united in the bonds of the same religion. Thus it was that Paganism, as a religion, did nothing to restore fellowship among men, and the only great efforts made to bring men together in the ancient world were made by conquest. Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and, last of all, and more successfully than any before, Romans, attempted to found an empire of the world; but this endeavour to bring men into one society was not based on any sense of the duty of man to man. It was, at best, an effort to rear an imposing monument to the selfish pride of a single race on the widespread humiliation and enslavement of the rest. How little the nations of antiquity with which we are acquainted—and which may be taken to be, on the whole, favourably representative of the rest—realised that man is his brother's keeper, will be seen if we consider how truly it has been observed that the ancient world, with its great institutions, its imposing civilisation, its splendid literature, its imperishable reputation in philosophy and its statesmanship, was yet a world without love. It cherished virtues which looked like charity. It made much, for instance, of liberality. In the ancient world it was much more common to give costly presents than it is among us. The museums of Europe are full of inscriptions which show how prodigal and how numerous were donations of all kinds, whether of a public or of a private character. Men who could afford it gave generously to the state, or to their birthplace, as well as to their guests or friends or

relatives. One man builds a new theatre for his native city; another constructs a new road or an aqueduct; another rebuilds the ruined walls of the town in which he lives; or he erects baths in which the whole population may enjoy for nothing the advantages of cleanliness and refreshment; or he founds public libraries which are open to all; or he procures large importations of corn to be sold at a low price, or distributes gratis to a specified number of the poorer citizens. No man of wealth in ancient Rome, who desired worthily to fill his position in the state, could well decline the duty of giving away a share of his private wealth for the benefit of his fellow-citizens or for the public good. The value of liberality as a public and social virtue was unquestioned. This evidence of public spirit was, we must admit, a fine thing in its way, and it may suggest that some of us fall even below the heathen standard in these matters. But, as has been said, it was liberality—it was not charity.

Now, how does liberality differ from charity? The material result may in some cases be almost precisely the same, as in the provisions made in ancient days and since for cheap bread; but the motive has been radically different. Christian charity thinks only of the recipient; pagan liberality only of the giver. Christian charity looks at the distress of the needy; pagan liberality at the social position, or the political ends or ambitions, or at what is expected or hoped for from the donor. Pagan liberality is anxious that the recipient should be pleased; Christian charity that he should be really benefited. The object of charity is to relieve suffering; the object of liberality was to make friends. Christian charity was, at bottom, self-denying; pagan liberality was, at bottom, self-seeking. Christian charity, said the apostle who was its great preacher, "seeketh not her own." Pagan liberality, even when it made vast pecuniary sacrifices, sought nothing else but her own, and would have thought it foolish to do otherwise. The consequence of this difference in spirit is apparent in the results. According to the calculations of a scholar who has devoted himself especially to these investigations, one million five hundred thousand pounds sterling was spent during the great days of the Roman Empire in the way of public largesses in the city of Rome alone. Nothing was really done for the most suffering members of the population. The two hundred thousand recipients of grain in Rome did not receive enough to support their families. The great mass of the wealth which was distributed fell into the hands of those who were not really in want, but whom it was important, politically speaking, to conciliate. There were no hospitals at any time in ancient Rome; there were not even any poor houses. The building for the reception of the sick which was erected by the Emperor Antoninus Pius near the temple of Ascula Pius

was in reality a hostelry for pilgrims to the shrine of the God of Healing; it was not a hospital. No provision was made for widows or for orphans or for foundlings; and those who could not claim the honour of citizenship had no relief whatever extended to them. On the other hand, the vast sums which were profusely expended by public men tended to make the Roman people dislike work and devote themselves to pleasure with ever-increasing eagerness. When Julius Cæsar triumphed, the people were feasted at twenty-two thousand tables. Even under the philosophic Marcus Aurelius public games and gladiatorial shows were provided for the people on a hundred and thirty-five days in the year. The gladiatorial shows, in which men killed each other publicly for the amusement of thousands of their fellow-creatures, were the most costly and the most popular of public entertainments. Public men like Cæsar kept a large store of gladiators ready to be produced in the amphitheatre when a show might be politically desirable. Liberality of this kind secured popularity for the worst of the Emperors. Witness the crowd which went out to meet the Emperor Nero when, after murdering his own mother, he entered Rome, robed in white and crowned with wreaths of flowers. There was in the mind of such a people no relation whatever between a profuse liberality and a life of virtue.

Let us be just. A great calamity would sometimes appeal not in vain to a higher sense of duty in the old Pagan world. When, in the reign of Nero, a great theatre fell, and buried in its ruins nearly fifty thousand spectators, the wealthy Romans sent physicians and all kinds of medical appliances to the scene of the catastrophe, and they received the wounded into their houses. When in the year A.D. 69 Pompeii and Herculaneum were overwhelmed by an eruption of Vesuvius there was a general readiness in Italy to relieve those who escaped with their lives from the burning lava. But these efforts attracted a great deal of notice because they were exceptional. The rule in the ancient world was to let suffering shift for itself. Even the great orator Quintilian could only speak of the poor as "loathsome"; and, if Aristotle had in one age described slaves as "animated tools," Cato in another could speak of them as "cattle in the straw"—so little did some of the finest minds and the noblest natures in the ancient world believe man to be in any true sense his brother's keeper.

It was the Mosaic law (let us never forget it) which first said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." It was the law which ordered that "the stranger which dwelleth among you shall be unto you as one born among you. Thou shalt love him as thyself." And the picture of a good man which is so often drawn for us, and by different hands, in the Psalms, generally insists on this side of human duty. "A good man is merciful and

lendeth." "Blessed is he that considereth the poor and needy." Job is called a "father of the poor." The Proverbs in which the highest wisdom is so tersely condensed, tell us that, while "the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel," he that hath mercy on the poor honoureth God. Israel knew that God is merciful, and this knowledge made a profound difference in a Jew's estimate of duty towards other men. The prophets contain passages on this subject which were quite foreign to the spirit of the old paganism. Thus Isaiah: "Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house; when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?" But before our Lord came the force and beauty of this teaching warped and withered by the intense and, it must be added, narrow feeling of nationality which set in after the Captivity. The close contact with the heathen in the Captivity did more than anything else towards limiting the range of love in Jewish hearts by the idea of the nation. The law said, "Love thy neighbour," but the later Jew answered the question, "Who is my neighbour?" in the narrowest sense. He even excluded the Samaritan. Charity became formal, restricted, mechanical. Such a life of piety as that of Tobias shows how much that was saintly yet survived; and what can be more beautiful than his advice to his son?—"Be merciful after thy power. If thou hast much, give plenteously. If thou hast little, do thy diligence gladly to give of that little." But the latter Jew not seldom took heed that he did his alms before men to be seen of them; and so he had no reward of his Father which was in heaven. And the Talmud told him that alms should neither be given to nor accepted from the heathen, since the heathen were not entitled to kindness or compassion.

If our Lord had not come among us, things would have gone on in this way. The obligations of human brotherhood would have been largely or altogether repudiated, even to the end. He, indeed, might have said with better reason than Cain, "Am I the keeper of a corrupt and rebellious race?" He might have chosen to remain in the glory which He had with the Father before the world was; but He did choose to say, "Lo, I come." He came to be born at Bethlehem. He came to obey and work for thirty years at Nazareth. He came to undergo the agony and the bloody sweat of Gethsemane. He came to die on Calvary. He came—He, the Infinite and the Eternal—to take on Himself, with our mortal flesh, all the humiliations and the woes of poverty, all the griefs and sorrows—nay, all the crimes and degradations—of man's fallen estate. He took on Him a

burden which, as we know, was not His, but ours; and it was when this burden pressed with all its dreadful weight on His sinless soul and His wounded body that the cry escaped Him: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" He made Himself the Keeper and the Saviour of our sinful humanity; and as, to the eye of faith, through the ages of Christendom, He hangs upon His cross, sinners see in Him their representative and their propitiation before the awful purity of God, and His blood has a significance and a power which they cannot mistake. It is, says the apostolic writer, "the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel." Abel's blood recalls, for all time, the word of the murderer: "Am I my brother's keeper?" The blood of Jesus is that of the Shepherd of souls, dying of His free will, not only for His brethren, but for His enemies.

Abel's blood for vengeance
Pleadeth to the skies;
But the blood of Jesus
For our pardon cries.

And this event, the death of Jesus our Lord on Calvary, is the turning-point, depend upon it, in the history of the moral education of the human race. "I," He said, "when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me." At the foot of that cross on which His arms are stretched that they may embrace the world, we learn not only our own needs and what has been done by Infinite Love to meet them, but also our duties and how we should understand them. "Ye know the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, that when He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich." "He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him that died for them." Beneath His cross we understand, at length, how He would have construed Cain's phrase, "my brother." They are everywhere our brethren, because He, our Elder brother, died for all. You are wealthy, and that poor man who lives near you, and has little or nothing, is your brother. Or you are poor, and your brother is that wealthy neighbour of whom you think, perhaps, habitually with envy, if not with anger. Our brethren are not confined to those who can enter into our thoughts and sympathies; they are also those whose narrowness and ignorance make mutual sympathy and intelligence impossible. They are not only those who are honest and respectable, but they are those who are under the ban of society, outside the frontiers of decent and civilised life. Our brethren—they are not only our near relations by blood; they are not only our fellow-townsmen or our fellow-countrymen; they are not confined to the races which are now in the van of civilisation, or have in past days played a great part in the world's affairs. They are also the races on whose rights civilisation is apt to trample with such

heartless selfishness. They are the Indians of Australia and of America ; they are the Maoris of New Zealand ; they are the islanders of the Pacific. Our brethren are everywhere. On every human life has fallen from the Cross, whether it be recognised or no, a ray of Divine compassion. All have been objects of that world-embracing guardianship, and when we have learnt the first lessons of the Gospel we understand that, in some sense, each of us, like the Divine Redeemer, is his brother's keeper. And our duty in this matter is, and must be, measured by our endowments. "If thou hast much"—much truth, much time, much wealth at thy disposal—"give plenteously. If thou hast little, do thy diligence gladly to give of that little."

This duty of care and love which man owes to man is, no doubt, to be paid in part by effort to improve the bodily and material circumstances of those who need it. Our Lord Jesus Christ went about doing good—doing good in this restricted sense. He kept two classes especially in His view, or, rather, constantly about Him—the poor and the sick. They sought Him—many of them—only for the sake of what He could do to relieve their pain or their hunger ; but He did not on that account disallow their company, though He did point out the unworthiness of the motive which controlled them. Certainly the poor and the suffering were His associates. He lived with them ; He died among them. The Gospels, in the main, are a long record of His various relations with them. Nay, when He would name a class that should continue to represent Him among men when He had Himself withdrawn from sight, He chose not the wise and learned, not the powerful and the wealthy, but the poor and the suffering. It is of these that He will say : "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

And thus it was that the Christian Church was no sooner founded than it appeared as a society for the relief of suffering and poverty. As in a family where strict tenacity of private rights is overshadowed by a sense of common life, common objects, reciprocated affections, none of these first Christians said "that aught of the things he possessed was his own, but they had all things in common." One order of the sacred ministry was largely, although not exclusively, devoted to the administration of the public fund ; and there were common meals—afterwards, it is true, at Corinth, leading to desecration of the Holy Communion, which nevertheless, were originally instituted in order to provide for the regular sustenance of the poorer members of the Church.

Not to dwell too long on so attractive and so vast a subject, what a delightful picture is that which is presented to us in the Acts of the Apostles of a poor Christian woman, Tabitha of Joppa, "full of the good works and of the almsdeeds which she

did!" She must have had plenty to do in the narrow dirty streets and bazaars of the old Phœnician seaport town ; and there she spent her life till the end came ; there she gave her time and her labour and her little wealth to help the needy and the suffering as her Lord had done before. But for Him—but for His life of compassion and His death of voluntarily-accepted pain—Tabitha would have been leading a very different kind of life at Joppa or elsewhere, and there would have been so much the more unrelieved pain and want in the history of our race. Or take a man like Gaius, of whom all that we know is that St. John tells us that he did faithfully whatever he did to the brethren and to strangers. In those early days, remember, Christians were constantly moving from place to place. See what is said of Aquila and Priscilla, of Apollos, of Zenas, and of others, and you will observe that these and others were continually journeying about, whether for public or for private reasons. Such busy circulation could only be possible if some members of the Church devoted themselves to entertaining the travellers ; and this is why so much stress is laid in the apostolic epistles on the virtue of hospitality. "Use hospitality one to another without grudging," says St. Peter. "Be given to hospitality," says St. Paul. The Hebrew Christians are to be careful to entertain strangers, remembering that some have thereby entertained angels unawares. A bishop must be, besides other things, "given to hospitality," and Gaius seems to have excelled in this department of Christian practice. "Strangers," writes St. John to him—"strangers have witnessed of thy charity before the Church." It was the misery of Diotrophes that he did not understand the spirit of the life and the work of Gaius. But Gaius would never have been what he was but for the infinite charity which had taught him from the Cross that he did well to be his brother's keeper. And these are merely samples of what was going on all over the Apostolic Church ; and when a few years had passed voluntary works of mercy were organised and developed after a fashion which recent research is beginning to appreciate, and which showed the world how vigorous, how operative was the truth which Cain had to learn, which our Lord came to teach—that every good man is his brother's keeper.

One of the distinguishing efforts of some literary men in the last century was the attempt to give a new and special prominence to a virtue which was treated almost as if it had been a new manufacture or discovery—the virtue of philanthropy ; and two singular mistakes were made about it. Philanthropy was assumed to have reference only to the external and earthly life of man ; and it was regarded as a virtue which had been created by modern philosophy. Now, if anything is historically certain, it is certain that philosophy—which, from time to time, has said very fine things about our duties to each other within certain limits—never created any

such virtue among the people as philanthropy. Philanthropy was created at the foot of the Cross of Christ, and then it was patronised by the eighteenth-century philosophy. And this mistake about the origin of philanthropy was only less considerable than the other about its true range of operations. What is philanthropy but the love of man? Is that a true love of man which loves only his body and not his soul? Has philanthropy done its all or its best when it has built hospitals, when it has organised the relief of the poor, when it has advocated secular education, when it has generally promoted the temporal well-being of the people? How can suchlike efforts exhaust the duties of philanthropy, unless, indeed, man be only a body, with, perhaps, an added endowment of transient and perishing intelligence—unless his body be the central seat of his life, the only feature of his being whereof a true love of him need take serious account?

Has philanthropy, then, nothing to say to the true, indestructible man, to the being who lives within and beyond the senses, to the being who still lives when disease has done its work and when the coffin has been nailed down? Surely a philanthropy that would deserve the name cannot exclude from its purview the most intimate essence, the true being, the higher nature of man—his undying personality, his soul. Certainly He who loved man better than any other, the Divine Philanthropist—He did not do so. If He fed the hungry, He also bade men “labour, not for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life.” If He healed the sick, He told men of those worse diseases of the soul which He also, and He alone, could heal. He told them of a life which would last when that which His wonder-working touch had reinvigorated should have passed away.

No doubt, my brethren, if there were no hereafter, if all really ended at death, there would be reason in confining ourselves to provisions for the needs and to relieving the wants of this present life. It would be folly to spend time and money on unsubstantial creations of the fancy. They who deny the life after death are quite consistent in resenting the supreme importance which we Christians attach to preparation for it. But for any Christian who says with the Apostle, “We look not to the things which are seen, but to the things which are not seen, for the things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are not seen are eternal,” it must be clear that the true philanthropy must devote its highest and most strenuous efforts to the soul of man—to its enlightenment by the knowledge of God, to its expansion through the love of God, to its elevation, to its invigoration, through conformity to the will of God. And how is this possible without the knowledge and love of Him who has bridged over the gulf that separated man from God, the one mediator between God and man, the

man Christ Jesus? How is it possible without the Divine Guide who has dared to say, “I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me”? How is it possible, apart from His faith, His words, His Church, His sacraments, if His Apostle is right in saying that, “neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name given among men under heaven whereby we may be saved”?

As we, most of us, know, there are large and important questions profoundly affecting man’s material well-being which have, of late, interested thousands of people in this great city as they have never interested them before—questions as to the relation between labour and capital, between wealth and poverty, between social order and personal freedom, between the teaching of social experience and the ambitions of social hope, and there is, indeed, a great deal to be said about the importance of these great questions—nay, they would be of the very highest importance if only human life ended at death; but for us who know that it does not so end they are not the highest questions. It is, indeed, serious that in a great metropolis there should be so many thousand able-bodied men out of work, so many thousand children still uneducated or under-educated, such sharp contrasts as undeniably exist between our wealth and our poverty. No one can disguise the seriousness of these facts in themselves, or of the consequences to which they may possibly point; but what is more serious is this, that in spite of all the religious agencies of all who own the Christian name in London, taken together, there are about us even hundreds of thousands of human beings without any true knowledge of that which it most concerns them to know, of the testing which awaits man beyond the grave, of the gracious and awful Being whom they will meet in judgment, of the Divine Saviour who has died that they may live for ever, of the Holy Spirit who sanctifies and guides the children of God, of the means of grace whereby the higher life is bestowed on and sustained in the soul of man? Surely, it is an overwhelming and most distressing fact that here in London, where the Church of Christ has been planted for these many centuries, there should be so many thousands who live and die as though they had no Creator, no Redeemer, no Sanctifier. Whose fault is it?

My brethren, I have no wish to disguise shortcomings of which we, the ministers of the Church, may have been guilty heretofore, may be guilty now; but, in the main, this greater disaster is, as I believe, due to causes beyond human control. One of the greatest social facts of our time, with which in this, as in other matters, we have and shall have to reckon in the concentration of the population in great centres, in towns, in cities. This is not peculiar to England. It is going on all over the civilised world.

It is a product of many influences, of which, perhaps, the development of the railway system is the most operative. Under the influence of this cause London has grown more rapidly than any city in the Empire, probably, than any city in the world. It is still growing at the rate of some forty-five thousand a year. In other words, every year a much larger population than that of Oxford is added to London; and the consequence is that, while the population of country parishes, for which ample religious provision has been made in past ages, is being in some parts of the country considerably reduced, the population of London is increased at a rate which has distanced the utmost efforts of the Church to keep pace with it, and it is impossible to contemplate the result without the gravest concern. It would be easy to show that a vast accumulation of human beings engaged in a hard struggle for existence, and neither encouraged by the hopes nor controlled by the apprehensions which are inseparable from belief in a future life, may be a serious danger to the state. But you are Christians, and it is better to dwell on the infinitely greater danger of immortal souls "having no hope and without God in the world." This is, alas! a literally true description of the case of tens of thousands of our fellow-citizens living within a radius of five miles of St. Paul's; and it appeals to us with a moral force which no human words could possibly enhance.

Now, the great enterprise which the chief pastor of this diocese desires to press on your attention to-day is worthy of the best support that you can afford to give. It is intended to deal, so far as it may, with this state of things. The Bishop of London's Fund is a sum of money raised by subscription with a view of enabling the Bishop to do what he may to overtake the ever-increasing mass of spiritual destitution in his enormous diocese. It is invested in the names of well-known laymen. It is administered under the Bishop by a large and representative committee. It is, in fact, a continuation at the present day of the bold and noble efforts to grapple with the heathenism of the metropolis which were made half-a-century ago by Bishop Blomfield, but it is distributed with regard to the greater variety and elasticity of religious work and enterprise that is demanded by the circumstances of our time. It is expended in building and repairing churches, in mission-rooms, in school-rooms, in supporting clergymen and lay agents of various descriptions. It encourages, in short, every kind of church agency that can promote the knowledge and the love of God among the people of the metropolis. It can point to a noble record of work already done, of funds impartially administered, and great and signal encouragement to the cause of religion in very difficult circumstances. But the memorable year 1887, which in various ways made large demands on the generosity of the public, has im-

poverished to a most serious extent this useful and indispensable servant of the Church in London. The sum raised by the Fund in 1887 is little more than two-thirds of the sum which was raised in 1886. It falls short in respect of donations and subscriptions by upwards of five thousand pounds; and this deficiency, if it be not redressed by a serious effort, means the retreat of religion from the ground already occupied. It means the abandonment of the ground to the forces of vice and infidelity. It means the withdrawal of clergymen and other religious teachers, the closing of mission-rooms, in districts where nothing else exists to tell our fellow-men that they have immortal souls, and that death and judgment are close at hand. If the sum raised in 1886 had been raised in 1887, it would still have been far below the actual requirements of the immense suburbs of the metropolis; but the question now before us is not whether the operations of the Fund shall be extended as the spiritual needs of London demand, but whether many most useful agencies for promoting Christian faith and life must not be forthwith abandoned. Brethren, surely this state of things is only to be known in order to rouse us Christians and Churchmen to serious efforts and to sacrifices which they may rightfully demand at our hands. The days of great efforts for our Lord have not gone by. Only yesterday we were told that a princely-minded Churchman of Liverpool had offered to build for that great city the cathedral which it so greatly needs as a centre for Christian work and life; but the spiritual temple is more precious than the material, and it is the spiritual temple which is built up in London by the Bishop of London's Fund. If we are too infirm or too busy to take a personal share in doing what we desire for our brethren, we can do something—nay much—by deputy, and here is our opportunity. If we have not come prepared to give more than a conventional coin which will cost some of us little or nothing, let us try to do something really generous, really conscientious, if not magnificent, when we go home. In many a conscience I would fain hope the Divine Spirit is whispering the question, "Where is Abel, thy brother? Where are all those souls, made, like thee, for God, redeemed, like thee, by the blood of Christ, but lying in darkness and in the shadow of death through a neglect which thou mightest do something—it may be much—to repair?" Looking to the immense spiritual destitution of London, which lies, like the corpse of the first victim of human selfishness, at our feet, we dare not say, "Am I my brother's keeper?" We cannot forget that most gracious, most compassionate Saviour who died for all, who died for each one of ourselves, who died that "they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again."

Certain **HARNESS' Cure.**
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
 FOR
LADIES' AILMENTS
 Mrs. CRAWSHAW, 3, Princes' Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W., writes:—"After a fortnight's application of Harness' Electropathic Appliances the effect has been truly marvellous. For eight months my life was a terrible burden. I am now quite well again."
 Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. Pamphlet & Advice free on application to Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, the Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
 Only Address, **LONDON, W.**
52, OXFORD ST. (Corner of Rathbone Place.)
 Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 9, 1888.

IF YOU WISH PEACE, PREPARE FOR PEACE.

THERE were some sanguine spirits who hoped that the new German Emperor, Frederick III., might have been disposed to make some arrangement for the surrender, or neutralisation, of Alsace and Lorraine, which might heal that terrible breach between Germany and France, which is the great source of disquietude and danger to the peace of Europe. Unhappily, however, the Emperor lost no time in declaring his intention on that point. In a special proclamation, addressed to those Provinces, he said: "We are determined to preserve the rights of the Empire over these German territories, re-united with the Fatherland after a long interval." Then, unhappily, he is surrounded, on all hands, by men who are steeped to the lips in military ideas and traditions. That is, indeed, the great curse and calamity of Europe—the predominance of the military element in all its courts and governments. There can be no lasting peace while that continues. The attempt to base permanent peace on rivalry in fighting establishments, is like trying to build a house on the surface of a volcano—there is no security at any moment against an explosion.

We must reverse the old absurd maxim, "If you wish for peace, prepare for war," and say, "If you wish for peace, prepare for peace." Seek peace and ensue it. If one millionth part of the thought and care and labour and money expended in organising war, were devoted to organising peace, what blessed results might ensue to the world. But unhappily, while the resources of nations are lavished with unstinted prodigality

upon preparing and perfecting all the means tending to war, the interests of peace are left to hazard and accident. Unhappily, also, none of the great statesmen of the world can be induced to lay this to heart. Their whole system of policy is founded on the assumption that men of different nations must, of necessity, be natural enemies, always on the alert to assail and despoil one another, and that, for that contingency alone, must we be always preparing. But cannot they admit into their minds this other idea, that civilised communities may co-exist on the same planet, bound to each other by ties of mutual interest, and living on terms of mutual confidence and peace? And if that be conceivable, why not adopt means beforehand to meet the dangers of discord, and to settle them when they arise, as no doubt there is the possibility and the probability of certain differences arising among any body of human beings brought into relations of neighbourhood and intercourse with each other. At present everything is left to the *ultima ratio* of brute force, or to such attempts at conciliation, as may be made *after* the quarrel has broken out, and passions have already been provoked.

Let any one conceive the chaotic condition of civil society, if it were constituted on the same principle; if there were no authoritative law to regulate the relations of citizens to each other,—if there were no courts of law to adjudicate between them in case of difference—if all things were left to be decided by main force by the individual members of the community, or were to be met only by some off-hand arrangement extemporised for the occasion. To use the words of an eminent Judge, "In our civil affairs we never wait until a controversy occurs between two men, to establish a tribunal for hearing. We have permanent tribunals, and unless a different course is agreed upon, the tribunal already established decides the whole matter."

RECOLLECTIONS OF A PARISH PRIEST.

(Continued from page 262.)

It may occasionally be observed in those who have reached a high degree of Christian perfection as evinced in much abstraction from the world, and whose conversation may truly be said to be "in heaven," that they become somewhat impatient or else suspicious of professors of feebleness in the divine life. This appears to be a defect of character, and sometimes causes great pain to weaker brethren. All have not the same advantages of position, or previous training, though their striving after conformity to the perfect standard is sincere; and many, "though faint, are yet pursuing." Now, though our parish priest had a deep insight into human character and motives, so that it was a rare thing for him to be deceived by the most plausible pretender, yet this knowledge did not beget in him the least cynicism

or habitual suspicion. And while it enabled him* to detect the sincere but defective character from the mere formalist or hypocrite, it did not impair the hearty frankness with which he welcomed all who truly loved the Lord Jesus Christ.

A very important element in a clergyman's success, as every one is aware who has practised it, is domiciliary visiting. Having this imprinted in his mind, the solicitude for the spiritual welfare of his flock was not limited to the pulpit. He laboured constantly, and "from house to house," as one that must give account of those committed to his charge, that he might do it with joy—in the earnest language of the apostle of the Gentiles, "Warning every man, and teaching every man in Christ Jesus." Without a figure might he adopt the language of the same eminent model for all preachers of the everlasting Gospel, "I have made myself a servant to all, that I might gain the more." But in order to become familiar with the temporal and spiritual needs of his people, he organised a system of district visiting—a very useful adjunct to the clergyman's personal efforts. The procuring of this assistance was no difficult matter with our excellent pastor; for his evident zeal for the glory of God and the good of his fellow-creatures helped to kindle a corresponding feeling in others who were blessed with leisure; and may not all certainly expect this response?—the people reflect the minister: "As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man." Happy people! our gracious Lord was pleased to constitute himself debtor to such, and to affirm—"I was naked, and ye clothed me, sick, and ye visited me. . . . Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." And the honour of being the Lord's creditors is all the interest they expect!

A deep-wrought conviction of the truths of our most holy religion, and an awful sense of their importance that admitted of no exaggeration, produced an habitual earnestness in our pastor which no one could mistake. There was nothing artificial about him—no acting—no mere conventional phraseology—no affectation of a feeling to which his breast was a stranger: what he expressed came hot from the heart; and such is the force of truthfulness, that a slight knowledge of him sufficed to convey the impression of his sincerity. This is a momentous principle in ensuring the success of every public teacher. Earnestness supersedes the most elaborate rules of elocution, or the most astute reasoning: the philosopher and the clown are alike swayed by it; and if in all cases it does not convince, it commands universal respect.

As another trait in his personal character, I may observe that he was not indifferent to the opinion of good men. Perhaps we may say, that those only are who have no claims upon it. But as the fear of man, or seeking human approbation as the supreme rule, brings a snare, so, should it be inquired how he attained his high standard of Christian faith and practice, I would answer briefly, By acting uniformly for God, and as in God's sight. To this important principle every thought was subordinated. "What says the Bible?" or "Will such and such conduct, or occupation, or recreation, estrange me from God in prayer?" are the questions to be honestly put and fearlessly answered by him who is desirous of conforming his conduct to the unerring standard.

As he was endowed with powers of mind that had enabled him to master a large amount of natural science and ancient learning, so had his Almighty Bene-

factor entrusted him with wealth. Of this, as of his intellectual endowments, he considered himself, in the strictest sense of the word, merely the steward, for the use of which he one day would have to give account. He was in the habit of bringing before his people, from time to time, the claims of many of those societies which entirely subsist upon the Christian liberality so successfully drawn out of late years in this country. To these he subscribed munificently himself, and thus shamed others out of their selfishness: so that he was not only liberal himself, but became the cause of liberality in others. His support of missionary and kindred societies arose from love to his species; he looked upon every being made in the image of God, and endowed with a never-dying principle, as an object of the deepest interest, and therefore was he solicitous that all should be brought into the fold of Christ's flock, and so be made partakers of His redeeming grace. But when he relieved the temporal wants of the suffering and needy, he exercised much consideration to arrive at a sound judgment: for he held, that unless clergymen dispense their bounty with circumspection, they may do more harm than good; he was therefore extremely cautious not to foster inactivity or to paralyse exertion; and this he safely avoided by selecting the sick and aged as the most frequent objects of his bounty.

Recent discussions have given a prominence to the question as to the constitution and authority of the Church in England, to which our ancestors were strangers. This not being a fit subject for the pulpit, we shall not venture to specify his exact views concerning it. But we are safe in the assertion that upon principle and from affection he was a conscientious and uncompromising churchman. Perhaps it would be overbold to challenge for the Church of England the celebrated rule of Catholic faith—*semper, ubique et ab omnibus*, always, everywhere, and by all. But if this high ground be surrendered, it may fairly be asked, what church could submit to the test with greater confidence? However, this much vexed question is barren of good to the ordinary Christian: we could not with the leisure at our command bring it to a satisfactory issue; and this may have been the reason that he so seldom touched on the constitution of the church. Enough that we are convinced, as Vigilius said when opposing the heretic Eutyches—"Ours is the faith, and Catholic profession, which the apostles have delivered, the martyrs have confirmed, and the faithful kept until this day:" enough that we see our "Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down:" enough that the Episcopacy and the use of Liturgies can be traced, if not to Apostolic times, yet up to a period in the history of the Christian Church, long before its connection with the State—at which period Nonconformists suppose (though erroneously) they discover the first entrance of those corruptions which grew from bad to worse, till they had well-nigh effaced the lineaments of Christianity as handed down to us in the sacred oracles. It is true there may have been those who supposed that religion is intended to advance the interests of the church, instead of establishments being intended to promote the cause of religion. Such obliquities of judgment are inseparable from the selfishness of our nature; but who would think of grounding thereupon an argument against establishments?

These reflections may savour somewhat of digres-

sion. However, the contemplation of a good churchman naturally gave rise to them. It is the glory of the Church of England to educate—to bring out—to foster such men. The calm state of mind produced by a sound and settled formulæ of faith, the possession of a comprehensive Liturgy fitted to all the spiritual needs of fallen man, the connection of the teacher with the taught being such as not to hold out any inducements to the former to become a man-pleaser—these advantages give a good bias to the mind, and allow it a freedom to follow its own yearnings, which no other communion can so effectually furnish. But whatever importance we may attach to these views, charity need not suffer, nor did our pastor neglect its exercise: he followed assiduously St. Paul's exhortation to the Roman Christians, "As much as lieth in you live peaceably with all men." Without the least sacrifice of principle, therefore, political or religious, he kept up a mutual intercourse with many pious dissenters, which was productive of most important and beneficial results. As they held all the important doctrines of the Bible in common, and had one Lord and one faith, he was not concerned to magnify their differences; it only caused regret that scruples about discipline and matters of secondary importance did not admit of a closer union among members of the Church of Christ.

But that which more especially gave an individuality to his character, was a delicate regard for the feelings of others. By this means he attracted the unfeigned love of all with whom he came in contact in the various duties of his station. It was but seldom that he chided, and then only for some flagrant dereliction of duty: any oversight, or error through forgetfulness or lack of judgment, was, if noticed at all, only hinted at with the utmost good temper. What Clement Ellis says of the true gentleman was descriptive of him in his intercourse with those below him:—"It is his care that all the obedience and honour his inferiors are obliged to render unto him, may seem no more than an imitation of that he pays unto his superiors, and that the courtesy and civility of his equals may be thought nothing but the reflection of his towards them. . . . His inferiors may behold in him how well humility may consist with greatness, and how great an affability authority will admit of: by his practice our licentious world might easily be convinced that freedom and subjection may dwell together like friends." All undue familiarity was repelled, and yet no trace of harshness in his manner was discoverable: he knew well, no one better, how to temper the *fortiter in re* with the *suaviter in modo*; a lesson, we might judge, of difficult attainment.

Some persons may imagine that the above is an imaginary portraiture—that I have been depicting a perfect man. Not so: that would be a vain attempt. Nevertheless, the character of our pastor was so nicely-balanced that you could scarcely tell the side on which constitutional frailty preponderated. Doubtless he, as well as every other Christian, knew the "plague of his own heart;" he was not unconscious of those weaknesses which more or less cleave to every son of Adam: therefore he prayed and watched against their outbreak; he chastised himself daily, that the effect of his ministry might not be marred, and that he might not thereby cast a stumbling-block in the way of his weaker brethren.

But the time at length drew on when he must bid adieu to the scene of his travails, surrounded as it was

by monuments of his love and piety. As he had quitted his college life at the call of duty, so he relinquished his parish, under the solemn conviction—the result of much care and consultation with pious friends—that God required of him to undertake a most important charge elsewhere, involving onerous duties and great sacrifices. In a vision a man called unto Paul, "Come over into Macedonia and help us." And what followed? "Immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us to preach the Gospel unto them." Having then fully persuaded himself that an important work was delegated to him, he dared not resist: no thought of self warped his judgment; the simple question was, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

Such is the bliss of souls serene
When they have sworn and steadfast mean,
Counting the cost, in all to espy
Their God—in all themselves deny.

The grief evinced at his departure was as profound as it was extensive; it would be a libel on our common nature to suppose that it was feigned. The people felt that they had lost a judicious friend, who in every emergency might be consulted with advantage, and one whom they knew deeply sympathised with their every sorrow. "He wept with those who wept, and rejoiced with those who rejoiced:" to many, in truth, he was dearer than a brother.

And, in conclusion, we may be allowed to advert to the happy frame of mind such a man has a right to enjoy, arising from divers considerations; from having battled successfully, by help vouchsafed from on high, against the kingdom of Satan, and rescued so many who were held in thrall thereby—the approving conscience resulting from having delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and having caused the widow's heart to sing for joy—the knowledge that the heartfelt prayers and benedictions of hundreds followed him—and, more than all this, having received the gift of the Holy Spirit in such abundance whereby to conquer the evil of his own heart; to root out that selfishness which clings very closely to our fallen nature; so that those actions which men mostly consider as noble instances of self-denial had become so habitual with him as scarcely to cost him an effort. Minds unennobled by the grace of God never rise to this habitude. Notwithstanding, this is a small, very small part of his reward—a mere foretaste of that joy promised to those who do the will of God. Who can even conceive what that gracious promise includes—"Those that honour me, I will honour"? or that commendation and invitation, coming more immediately home to the Christian, emanating as it did from his Divine Master, as the reward of faithfulness to an important trust, and of which every godly minister may anticipate the comfort—"Well done, thou good and faithful servant . . . enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

The writer feels assured that many with him will echo most fervently the words of the Psalmist, when invoking blessings on the friend of the needy:—"Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the Lord shall deliver him in the time of trouble. The Lord preserve him and keep him alive, that he may be blessed upon earth; and deliver not thou him into the will of his enemies. The Lord comfort him, when he lieth sick upon his bed: make thou all his bed in his sickness."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

SIR,—In the *Times* of the 15th inst. there is a very interesting review of the late Lord Shaftesbury's life. In 1848 thrones were falling and the working classes dissatisfied. The Prince Consort consulted Lord Shaftesbury on what he could do to prove the interest he felt for the working classes in London. Lord Shaftesbury advised the Prince to take the chair at the next anniversary of the Labourers' Friend Society. The Prince did it, and was received with enthusiasm. A noted socialist remarked at the time, "if the Prince goes on like this, why he'll upset our apple-cart." It was under this conviction that the clergy of our Church could if they would do something towards "upsetting the apple-cart" of ignorance, superstition and opposition to religion amongst many of the working classes, that I ventured to advocate our duty as clergy, and the advantage to society of seeking to widen our usual addresses from the pulpit.

The baneful effects of ignorance and superstition were seen in the middle ages, they have exhibited themselves in Roman Catholic countries generally, and their anti-Christian and socialistic turn is brought home to our doors in Ireland, and London is being infected.

To expect a nation of such magnitude in numbers and complexity of interests, as our English nation has become, to continue great and happy apart from a real hold on religion, is to expect a rose to grow and flower in a pot of sawdust. I have no lack of belief, if a living faith be preached and exemplified, that it will do its work of vital good, but any of your readers who have mixed with the working classes in town and country, will understand me, in trying to meet their wants in this age by trying to widen and deepen their intelligence generally, that we may lead others to take a truer view of religion, its verities and demands. There is much said about "increased intelligence," but much of this boasted intelligence is of the very shallowest character.

The Socialistic doctrines which are being flouted in London and elsewhere, are the bastard children of ignorance not of intelligence; about as like to truth as an intelligent Englishman is to a Fuegian, the bare similarity of features in the demands of socialism to tone, progress, and national weal, is mistaken for perfect identity. Our religion we know is founded on *facts*, but no one will assert that the moral virtues which spring from a reception of the facts, are naturally palatable. Science rests on facts, and the knowledge of its facts does not raise moral opposition in the same way as the facts of religion do, while the more these scientific facts are studied in their social and personal importance, the better able men become to grapple with many evils in life. Ignorance of the laws and economy necessary for carrying on in health and happiness a nation like ours, is an evil far more at the root of the discontent, which vents itself in speechifying in Trafalgar Square than real distress. The genuine "working men" have, in many instances, come forward and disowned these agitators and revolutionists. The more these be the class of our working men find in us clergy, fellow men who are trying

to help them to help themselves, the more I fancy will our legitimate influence for good be extended.

Let us try and direct the rational faculties of our fellow countrymen, by placing before them incontrovertible facts touching God's works and the principles of health and happiness. Let habits of accurate observation be encouraged by our aid, and the mind be led to proper conclusions from physical facts observable but not observed; if so, we may hope that more accurate reasoning and deduction may come in to correct erroneous reasoning and inferences, in things divine, social and political.

The study of natural history, natural philosophy, the various facts respecting the atmosphere, the waters, the wonderful works of God in the adaptation of man, birds, beasts, fish to their varied conditions of life, are subjects referred to in the Bible; and it often appears to me in such a terse way, that the writers knew much more about these matters than we moderns give them credit for. Solomon's knowledge was not hid under a bushel, and must have been scattered abroad. Job did not write the 28th chapter without considerable knowledge of ores and mining. It was a favourite chapter of mine when I was a youngster. I have preached from some of its sublime passages, with one of the rivers of God rolling over golden sands running before me; but I never understood how far mining knowledge and appliances went in Job's days, until I read two papers in the 1st series of the *Expositor*, vol. ix. Let any one read those papers, and "the wisdom of the ancients" will derive new significance, and some humble notions that we have not made more discoveries in the lapse of ages. The light thrown on Job xxviii by those papers, must interest any congregation. I will add a very practical argument. Such carefully acquired knowledge—enough to feel that we can really enlighten ignorance—will tend to prevent many of those diseases and fatal accidents which come from ignorance of the laws which govern the operations of nature; in other words, which show how much God has done to guard life, and how little man does to show his care in preserving it. In our large cities, you will find as a necessary precaution to sewers bursting, an iron grating at intervals over sewers. Railway bridges are allowed for good reasons to cut your view of noble buildings, but no one exclaims at all those noxious gases being let loose under their noses and lungs. To suggest that these holes should have an iron tube affixed, leading the noxious gases upward above our dwellings, would be monstrous. I suppose because spoiling our streets! then let them be made ornamental and used as extra gas standards. I don't say the clergy will immediately reconcile "science and religion," by advocating such a dreadful innovation; and if they came forward to propose such a rational means for preserving life and health, they might stir a hornet's nest, but I do say confidently that, if the majority of rate payers were enlightened as to the reasons why such changes in our streets should be made, the clergy would have little trouble in seeing their rational ideas carried out, for "the masses" would take up this and many more kindred matters for themselves; having learnt the fact, that they were physically, mentally, morally injuring themselves and their families, by living regardless of the laws of nature.

A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, November 16, 1886.

N.B.—I began with referring to Lord Shaftesbury. I cannot do better than reminding your readers, sir,

that his great influence with the working classes, arose from his combining a high religious ideal with a high Christian life; but this alone would not have obtained him the enviable position he held, had he not from early life to the day of his death combined with his devotion to the Christian faith, an unwearied desire and endeavour to improve by advice and personal labour, the working man's condition in life as a man, as a citizen, as husband and father.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES.

SIR,—As I have ventured to express myself on “the gift of tongues” in a sermon, in a somewhat different manner to the explanations usually given in commentaries, I should be greatly obliged if you would allow me, through your publication, to seek the opinion of others, that, if mistaken I may be corrected.

As the day of Pentecost was the antithesis of the day of Babel, it would be well to consider first what the confusion of tongues was.

God has two ways of making Himself understood by man, viz., by voice or by inspiration. It is only the *voice* which is now considered. God conversed with Adam: for this purpose he endowed him with a perfect tongue or voice—the language of Paradise—and this Adam may reasonably be supposed to have brought out of Paradise with him, and taught it to his descendants; when they multiplied and rebelled against God He confounded the language and divided it into seventy different tongues (Gen. x. 31).

In Gen. xi. 1 we are told that till the confusion there was one speech. May it not be stated that in all languages there may be some words which may be traced to a common root: e.g., *ecclesia*, *église*, *eglios*, *chiesa*? And these words in speaking, hearing, and seeing, are sufficiently confounded or confounding.

Is it too bold to say that God could not speak an impure tongue, an imperfect or broken language, and that, in His talking with Abraham, He would speak in that perfect language or voice which it pleased Him to give to Adam in Paradise, of course bringing Abraham's ear into a receptive state? So also of the voice, in the case of Moses on Sinai—the people only hearing the trumpet and the thunderings—or of the call of Samuel, or the still, small voice Elijah heard, etc.

Since there was a time when men spoke only *one* language, which God divided, making men to speak in tongues they never learned, if at Babel all was confounded, may not all language—for the short time—at Pentecost have been *re-united*, and only one speech uttered, which was miraculously *many-tongued*.

There is no doubt the disciples were heard to speak in language of which they had no previous knowledge. The multitude hearing of it came together and were amazed; of this multitude there were, as afterwards shown, 3,000 believers, but others, outsiders, or those who mingled with them, were mockers, and said these men were filled with new wine. To them the one language, the language of Paradise, the voice (Godet calls it the *unique* language), was a sealed tongue, a mere jargon of sound.

This gift of tongues seems to have lasted till the baptism of the 3,000. There is no mention of these gifts till Acts x. 46 granted, for the same reason as at Pentecost, as a sign and proof of the divine approval and admission into the new-born Church. Smith's Dict., page 1,557, line 1, says of St. Paul, “who

spake with tongues more than all,” that when he was at Lystra there is no mention of his using the language of Lycaonia—in Acts xiv. 11, it is implied he did not; then here the Spirit gave him utterance and the people *heard* him. When St. Paul was smitten with blindness, he heard the *voice* speaking to him, while his companions only thought it thundered.

Now by some it is thought, that, in making the Pentecostal gift a miracle of hearing as well as speaking, its wonder is lessened. How so? Our Lord promised unity with Himself and the Father, so on the day of Pentecost He admitted the people into a measure of the Divine Presence, that they might hear and understand what was spoken in the language of Paradise, restored by the second Adam. The Apostles were specially charged not to premeditate, that the utterance might be of God. So then, while St. Peter was addressing the people, to “his own” hearing he spoke in his own tongue (Aramaic), but to the nationalities he was speaking to each in their own tongue, at one and the same moment. The miracle in his case speaking, in theirs hearing. Does it not seem in the account of the tongues, 1 Cor. xii.-xiv., that at the time St. Paul was writing that an untruthful claim to the possession of tongues had crept in. And St. Paul does not know who, or how far to condemn. So he advises plain speaking instead. The economy of miracles was drawing the supernatural to an end. Common sense, guided by a religious faith, was to hold its proper place. If not so, why should not tongues have been continued until now? Tongues that could bear no interpretation from anyone must be liable to the suspicion of being at least hysterical sounds, while the charity of a St. Paul would stop a person from charging the utterer with wilful assumption of a power hypocritically claimed. From this danger the Pentecostal utterances were free, and the language being understood by all was because it was the restored and *reunited* speech, the language of Paradise, and that whenever the voice of God is mentioned, it was the distinct and perfect utterance of the language of Paradise.

As I think in this use of the expression “the language of Paradise” I have drawn out the antithesis to the confusion at Babel in a somewhat different way to what has been usual, I shall be greatly obliged by the criticisms of kindly minds, and shall be yours, obliged,

C. J. WILDING.

Arley, May 1888.

Reviews and Notices.

“THE EXPOSITOR.” June, 1888. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

WE have seldom seen a better number of the *Expositor* than this; there are eight papers, and they are all exceedingly good.

Dr. Wright concludes his remarks on the Pre-Christian Jewish interpretation of Isaiah lii. liii., and shows the hopelessness of any other interpretation than the Messianic.

Professor Wilkins reviews Dr. Alexander Roberts' recent volume: “Greek the language of Christ and His Apostles,” and in our opinion has an easy task to answer it. Dr. Edersheim says (*Life*, Vol. i. p. 130) “We know that the language of the Temple and the Synagogue was Hebrew, and that the addresses of the

Rabbis had to be "Targumed" into the vernacular Aramaic, and can we believe that in a Hebrew service the Messiah could have risen to address the people in Greek; or that He would have argued with the Pharisees and Scribes in that tongue, especially remembering that its study was actually forbidden by the Rabbis? No amount of "coincidences," all quite easy of explanation, if we assume, as we well may, that Christ and His Apostles could *read* Greek, can upset this argument; to add to it is only to carry coals to Newcastle.

Mr. Page furnishes some good critical notes on the Lord's Prayer. Dr. Plummer's paper called "This do in Remembrance of Me," is really an answer to an article in the "Church Quarterly Review," claiming to translate *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* by "sacrifice this"—or at any rate to claim this as the meaning. We remember the aforesaid article, but did not read it; therefore we will only say that Dr. Plummer might have strengthened his argument by a careful examination of the LXX. usages of *ποιεῖν*. We sadly want a good commentary on that shamefully neglected but invaluable book, the LXX.; a competent scholar who would devote himself to the work, would not be amongst those who "have no memorial."

Professor Stokes' article on the Fayûm manuscripts is so interesting, that we should like to quote it all, and Dr. Marcus Dods writes on "The Stater in the Fish's Mouth." Altogether a very good number indeed.

—◆—
"THE VOICE OF THE YEAR—" A. S. Lamb. Published by James Nisbet & Co. Price 1s.

A BOOK of one thought, viz., Beware of the results which Romanism is trying to bring about in Protestant England. Mr. Lamb seems to have been able to judge this very important question from an unprejudiced standpoint, and has most artistically painted our present crisis with regard to a revival of Romish power. The absence of invective and the clear and bold declaration of facts which it contains, make it quite a treat to read Mr. Lamb's book. Many passages are of a distinctly comprehensive nature, to quote, p. 27, "England was great—great because free—free because Protestant"—p. 28, "There is still undoubtedly much genuine evangelical Protestantism amongst us, but there is at the same time much Protestantism that is not evangelical. There is much Protestantism that is not even justly entitled to the name of Christianity"; and again, p. 42, "Once let Romanism regain its sway in this country, and bondage—bondage ecclesiastical, political, social, and even domestic, is England's lot." If every English Christian would read and verify for himself the statements in this book, Rome might in vain seek to regain her sway in this, up to the present, free country.

—◆—
A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this daper.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allott, Rev. Robert, B.A., Rector of Maltby-in-the-Marsh, Alford.
Armistead, Rev. T. B., M.A., Vicar of Winmarleigh; Rural Dean of Garstang.
Bellars, Rev. W., M.A., late Vice-Principal of the Leeds Clergy School, and Senior Curate of All Hallows', Barking; Vicar of Margate.
Blyth, Rev. E. H., M.A., late Vicar of Margate; Rector of Saltwood, near Hythe.
Buckwell, Rev. W. B., M.A., Chaplain to the Barnet Union.
Butter, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of St. Michael's, Coventry; Vicar of Neasdon-cum-Kingsbury.
Carew, Rev. Gerald Pole, Curate at St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol; Vicar of Lostwithiel, Cornwall.
Coling, Rev. R. J., Rector of Stow Maries, Essex.
Craigie, Rev. C. E., M.A., Senior Curate of St. George's, Edgbaston; Vicar of Kington, Herefordshire.
Evans, Rev. Wm. Addams-William, B.A., Rector of Llanddewi-Vach, Monmouthshire.
Evans, Rev. W. Jones, B.A., Curate of Holyhead; Vicar of Anglesey.
Fletcher, Rev. M. D., Vicar of Marden, near Devizes.
Garrett, Rev. George Henry St. Patrick, B.D., Curate of Christ Church, Leeson-park, Dublin; Vicar of Widnes, Lancashire.
Goldney, Rev. Reginald Philip, B.A., Vicar of Penalt, Monmouthshire.
Hensley, Rev. E. J., Vicar of Chepstow; Surrogate for the Diocese of Llandaff.
Hillier, Rev. W. L., Curate of St. Paul's, Exeter; Vicar of St. Luke's, Sheffield.
Holdom, Rev. J., Curate of Knaresborough; Curate-in-Charge of Wath, near Ripon.
Jones, Rev. L. T., Vicar of St. Leonard's, Leicester; Vicar of All Saints', Wellingborough.
Jones, Rev. William, Curate of Telattyn; Vicar of Pontfadog, Llangollen.
Metcalfe, Rev. Robert Weston, M.A., Chaplain of Berar, India; Vicar of Ravenstonedale, Westmoreland.
Moorhouse, Rev. M. B., Vicar of St. Mary Bredin, Canterbury; Vicar of St. Luke's, South Lyncombe, Bath.
Myres, Rev. W. Miles, Vicar of Swanbourne, Rural Dean of Minster; Surrogate in the Archdeaconry of Buckingham.
Owen, Rev. Elijah, Rector of Llangold, Anglesey.
Rubie, Rev. G., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Peter's, Accrington; Incumbent of Witherslack, Grange-over-Sands.
Stevenson, Rev. Arthur Bicknell, M.A., Curate; Vicar of Fillongley, Coventry.
Swinnerton, Rev. James, Perpetual Curate of Maindee, Monmouthshire.
Taylor, Rev. H. E., Curate of St. Decuman's, Somerset; Chaplain of the Fishermen's Church, Hastings.
Wadeson, Rev. E. G., M.A., late Curate of Ebbesston-with-Allerton; Vicar of Thornton-le-Street, near Thirsk.
Workman, Rev. Arthur William, M.A., Vicar of Wrangle, Boston.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bond, Rev. William Peter, formerly Government Chaplain at Tasmania, afterwards a long time Rector of St. Thomas's, Fulham, on the 26th ult., aged 76.
Burridge, Rev. T. W., Vicar of Eastbury, on the 24th ult., aged 68.
Chalker, Alfred Ball, Canon of Carlisle Cathedral, on the 2nd inst., aged 60.
Cornell, Rev. T. V., late of Fownhope, Hereford, on board the P. and O. steamer *Carthage*, April 27th, aged 37.
Heath, Rev. Dunbar Isidore, M.A., formerly fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Vicar of Brading, Isle of Wight, at Esher, on the 27th ult., aged 72.
Hoggan, Rev. Charles Adam, M.A., of Oriel College, Oxford, formerly Rector of Talaton, Devon, on the 25th ult.
Kirkpatrick, Rev. Thomas, of Egremont, late of Baildon, Yorks, on the 30th ult.
Kitchin, Rev. Francis, M.A., Senior Chaplain and Precentor, the Cathedral Church of St. Mary, Edinburgh, on the 31st ult., aged 46.
Lee, Charles, Vicar of Badwell Ash, late of the Medical Madras Service, H.E.I.C.S., on the 29th ult., aged 57.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TRUE VINE.

BY THE BISHOP OF COLOMBO.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, ON SUNDAY, APRIL 25TH, 1888.

"I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman."
—JOHN XV. 1.

IF we call this a parable, it is because we hold that a parable may be the highest effort of language, not to throw an accidental side-light on things, but to express their inmost nature. The form of language is indirect; the effort of thought is most direct, intense, and penetrative.

In the teaching of to-day's Gospel two stages may be marked; the first verse opening up the thought by the words: "I am the true vine and my Father is the husbandman"; the fifth opening a second stage, in its application to the disciples: "I am the vine; ye are the branches." In the first stage, the thought is, primarily, of the relation of Christ to the Father: "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman." The correlative here of "vine" is "husbandman." In the second is emphasised the relation of Christ to believers; the correlative there of "vine" is "branches."

This distinction is further marked by the word "true," which is present in verse 1, but not in verse 5. In relation to the husbandman, there is essential contrast between the wild or degenerate vine, which disappoints the husbandman, and the true vine, which is what it is meant to be, and bears the fruit expected of it. But in relation to the branches, there is no such contrast; both false and true vines carry their branches alike. This must be why our Lord, when He is going to add "My Father is the husbandman" begins "I am the true vine," but before the words "ye are the branches" says simply "I am the vine."

It must be admitted that these two stages of the thought are not kept clearly apart, for the second is anticipated in the third and fourth verses, before its principle has been stated. But the distinction is a real one, and by not noting it, some readers go away with an imperfect conception of the passage as a whole.

Some readers, and not a few commentators, not noting the distinctive character of the first verse, treat the whole passage as merely a revelation of the close union of believers with Christ. They overlook the revelation of Christ's relation to the

Father. Overlooking this, they necessarily have an imperfect view of the other; for it is from the relation of Christ to the Father, that the relation of believers to Christ takes its character. What the branches receive by abiding in the Vine, is determined by the nature and circumstances of that Vine; by its being the True Vine, and having the Father for its Husbandman. To put this in other words, we lose much if we read here no more than a comparison to the relation which the branches of any sort of tree, good or bad, wild or cultivated, bear to their stem. The teaching is immeasurably illuminated by the thought that the tree in question is that tree which bears the richest fruit, and by the thought of the Divine Husbandman tending it, and watching for the fruit, with a view to which he planted it, prunes it, and will glorify it.

Nothing, I think, would be gained by trying to determine that one of these two relations was Our Lord's main purpose, or came earlier in His thoughts than the other. Such an inquiry would be in reality only an attempt to lay on the fulness of Our Lord's thought the limitations of our own. Without doing so, I will endeavour to-day to draw out part of His meaning, from the starting point of the first verse rather than of the fifth.

If we turn back to the twelfth chapter, there we find Our Lord looking forward to the fruit of His passion; looking forward to "much fruit" as the result of His death. When "certain Greeks" desired to see Jesus, the Lord was moved to answer, "The hour is come when the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die *it abideth alone* (*αὐτὸς μόνος μένει*) but if it die it beareth much fruit." He was looking forward to the glorification of the Father by the extension of His own work, by the multiplication of living agencies in which His own life should be reproduced. And so he went on—as was his wont—from Himself to His followers, to speak of them also as finding their own lives by losing them.

This was before the Last Supper; after it He said again, "Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him." On God's glory, as the result of all, His mind was bent. Later on, He spoke of His own work, and of those which His disciples should do; "greater works" even, redounding even more to the Father's glory, because He Himself was going to the Father, in Whose presence He would accomplish all their prayers, "That the Father might be glorified in the Son."

Fruit-bearing, to the Father's glory, by His own life in His disciples—this was evidently a leading thought, among the thoughts that grew more and more vivid, and pressed with ever-increasing intensity and agony of desire and zeal upon His soul, as the hour came on.

In this general connection we may receive the words with which, on that last evening, after an

interval of silence, our Lord resumed His discourse, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman." His eye is turned to the Father, by whom He has been planted in the soil of humanity, to bear that fruit which humanity had failed to bear. He feels the Husbandman's hand—the awful, chastening hand, upon Him; and in Himself He feels the whole energy and all the sap of His being flowing in obedience, in joyous readiness, to bear His fruit to that Father's glory. His words are not a parable, throwing from outside the light of an illustration upon known truth; they are the bursting forth of life's own self-expression. A whole history of humanity, a whole act of filial self-dedication, a whole future of ever-widening rich growth and fruitfulness, are gathered into the calm words, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman." In that utterance are registered the Fall of man, the Incarnation and Sacrifice of the Second Adam, and the triumph of the Church.

There was the long disappointment of the past ("Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?"); the down-trodden helplessness of fallen men, which had brought the Son of God from heaven ("Look down from heaven, and behold, and visit this vine!"); the perfecting of obedience ("Lo! I come to do Thy will"); and beyond all these, the prospect of everlasting vintage ("From me is thy fruit found").

Thus viewed, our text is a prophecy of the fruit which Humanity, gathered together in Christ, bears to the glory of the Father. And how naturally, how graciously, this thought passes into—or rather unfolds as what had been wrapped up in it—the thought of us, the branches! On the branches, too, the great Husbandman exercises His art; deals with them in unswerving holiness and love; helps them to bear their fruit, or takes them away if they refuse to bear.

Amid the wealth of teaching which this passage enfolds, let us dwell for a few moments on the idea of *fruit*, which runs through it all, and which is proved to be a principal one by the closing verse: "Herein is my Father glorified that (ye) bear much fruit; and (so) shall (ye) be my disciples."

Fruit is essentially connected with life, of which it is both result and beginning. It is not merely a mechanical result or cause, but involves the continuity of life. And Christian life bears fruit, not merely consequences. The value of this truth may be shown by contrasting it with the mechanical view of action and consequence, with which I am very familiar in the writings of the Buddhists, whose system of morals would fail of all efficient vitality, if only through this one defect. In those writings, and in the daily conversation of Buddhists in Ceylon, nothing is commoner than the phrase, "the fruit of action," fruit which "ripens" into pain or pleasure. But while the word used is "fruit," there is no idea associated with it of

organic life, or of growth towards what is better, or of any of the charm or healthful power which belongs to fruit, still less of a capacity for renewed life. Actions are treated as mechanical facts, effecting a mechanical consequence, exactly as by what we call a law of nature. Such a merely physical aspect of action has, of course, a sound physical meaning, and even in a Christian country it is possible for men to limit their view to this; though to do so is utterly unscientific, because it leaves out of sight a principal element of human action, *will*, which, however generated, is not itself a mechanical phenomenon. But religion gives us an entirely different idea of conduct. All conduct is vitalized by will. That will, in a faithful Christian, is guided and set in motion by the living influence and presence of Christ. The effect of such action, while it takes place according to law, is produced by living will, by the power of the same living Christ. The furthest consequences of such action are conducted by Christ-power; they are set in motion and controlled by conscious, loving, joyous, personal will. Such consequences are *fruit*; joy is fulfilled in them; they abide; it is seen at the last that all has been "wrought in God."

Since, at the first, God made the trees, bearing fruit in which was their seed, upon the earth, the lovely life of all the vegetable world has been a parable of this. We sympathise—it is one of the widespread marks of nature's touch by which all life is in some sense kin to us—we sympathise with the upspringing of the green shoots, and with the opening of folded leaves in their multitudes, till the delicate marvel of the beech-tree bough feathers out and floats upon the buoyant air: we rejoice with the jewelled fields, and hedgerows white with May, and all the glory of summer bloom: and we triumph with the waving corn, and golden-laden boughs of autumn, and stored wealth of fruit and seed, that holds the promise of another spring. Man goes along, heart to heart, with this joyous progress; every step in it so rich with feeling, and decorated with the symbols of a living control. It may be we are but reading into it the likeness of the life within ourselves. But if that be so, then all the stronger is the witness to the truth, that human conduct is no mere sequence of mechanical effect on cause, but is alive, and meant to be divine. Human action, without God, though it begins in will, soon dies into a mechanical impulse: it has consequences, but it bears no fruit; or its fruit does not abide: but Christ-action in man, as it begins in God-guided will, lives on in God's good pleasure, and its result is fruit, and its fruit abides.

"Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit." Our Lord's words evidently refer, in some measure, to what we call "work for God." He has been looking forward to the extension of His Gospel, the drawing of all men to Himself; and now He speaks of the association, for these

purposes—in a way wonderfully close and necessary—of His disciples with Himself.

A vine bears fruit—how? Through the branches. On the branches and on their fruitfulness all the vine's fruitfulness depends. One branch may wither, yet another bear; but if it were possible that all should fail, fruit would be none. It is a wonderful honour, then, to be called "branches" by Him who is the Vine. It means no less than this: "I entrust my cause to you; I am content to wait for my fruit till you bear it; through you I choose to live my life; with all my yearning for fruit I inspire you; what you bear, I shall own."

How full of suggestions these thoughts are as to the meaning of Christian work; as to the responsibility and joy of the Christian missionary; as to the future of a Christian college! Some such thought inspired the founder of my own college, when he delighted to speak of it as his "vine." He trusted that the sap of the True Vine would flow through its branches and give them power to bear. And by such thought to-day our prayers for Keble College may be guided, as we draw near to exercise what power of life there is in us in drawing from our Lord new supplies of life-power, for fruit-bearing yet to be. May you, dear brethren, to-day and ever, so abide in Him, and bear much fruit, and fulfil His joy and have your own joy fulfilled in the glory of the Father! May you stretch forth your branches unto the sea, and your shoots unto the River! May you be allowed, if God will, to see some of the fruit even in this life; even on this side of Jordan some clusters from the valleys of the Promised Land!

To such a blessedness we all of us are called, to abide in Christ, as branches in a vine, and by His strength to bear the fruit that Almighty God loves.

All that men have dared to dream of the high destiny of man and of the condescension of God, falls short of this. And, meanwhile, this is true to what we are conscious of, our own personality. There is no merging of the individual life; individual life is intensified and exalted. On the other hand, there is no hope held out to a man of happiness or abiding capacity apart from God: "Apart from me ye can do nothing." It might be shown at length, were this the time for it, how perfectly philosophical, how free from vague mysticism, this divine description of human perfection is: although, like all the fruits of the Incarnation, it rests upon a mystery, which lies outside the range of our understanding. But now let us rather thankfully adore the condescending love of our Master, who invites us to such union with Himself. It was much that He should be the Shepherd, to tend and know His sheep; this is something nearer, and more continuously affects not our outward security alone, but our inner being. That wonderful experience of St. Paul, for which he could find no expression short of the words—so daring, so tremendous in

their originality when they first shaped themselves on his lips—"Not I live, but Christ liveth in me," was the experience of the fulfilment of this promise.

When he was constrained to describe "a power that worketh in us mightily," he was feeling this flow of the True Vine's sap within him.

There is nothing more delightful than the sense of life. The mere joy of living—we know it well—when health and strength can hardly find room for their overflow, and light up the world with careless flashes of their own force! Something flows in the veins that is more than blood. Yes, and it stirs something in the heart that is more than the gladness of the moment. The world open before you; the career to be run; the career of heroism, the career of good. Are these not times for you when nobler and fairer than them all looks and feels the career of self-sacrifice? The sap of the True Vine is in your veins. Rejoice in it; live by it; let it enlarge and adorn your life; give yourself to its beautifying force. Jesus is this life-power: His personal influence exerts this force.

Is this vague or impossible? Not at all. All nature prepares us for it. When the electric current flows along a wire, and by its mere neighbourhood there are induced in another wire, which it does not touch, movements of magnetism, or heat or light—we cannot see or note the process of that influence. When sunlight falls on the living organism, and wakens the nerves to quicker power, and gives intensity and health to the process of life—how little can any science of ours take account of its steps! Yet again, when in human eyes one dear look kindles in another heart the joy of love, or pours out in an instant the pent-up floods of memory, here is an energy entirely out of sight and unknown to science, yet no less real and unique for being almost wholly spiritual. These comparisons fall short, infinitely short, of the working of Christ-life in the branches of the True Vine, yet they help us towards the thought of it; and they ought to make it easy to believe, that the God who made us can bring His own life to bear on us, in the God-man, by ways that lie altogether outside the range of our present powers to understand.

And many of us, through God, know by experience that it is so. We have proved it in prayer; we have proved it in communion. The wonder is, —sad and ever-increasing wonder!—that we can know such things so well, and use them so little.

To a great future, indeed, our Lord invites every one of us. Let us believe in it, and live for it. Every branch has its fruit to bear; each in his own duty. And by the harmonious growth of all, the Vine will fill the new heaven and the new earth with immortal fruit.

Souls are to be won for Christ; His kingdom is to be advanced throughout the world; the Father is to be glorified in the Son. Every one of us has his part; into every one of us the Divine is prepared to flow, more and more richly. Oh! how

poor and narrow is any ambition, in comparison with this! May He awaken our faith, our hope, and our love; yours here in Oxford, ours in our distant land, that we may not put from us our infinite happiness.

The True Vine is planted now in heavenly soil, and its beauty rejoices the heavenly air. Some of the branches are bearing good clusters even in the chill climate of this world. Some, like the saints whose memory we cherish to-day, live in rest, their fruit abiding, under the windless skies of Paradise. But it is one tree, one Life. And if we have to mourn some withering, some lifelessness, around us—and alas! how much more in ourselves!—yet we have but to look away to the fair glory of those flourishing branches, to be sure that the root can never fail us, that there is life to be had, and had abundantly, if only we abide in Him.

Let us seek, with the Holy Spirit's aid, to enter into the mind of our true Vine. Oh! that we might feel something of what He felt, when He gave Himself that name before His Passion; something of His self-surrender, His hope, His love; as we look up to our Father which is in heaven, and pray that the fruit He seeks may be ripened, that His name may be hallowed, His kingdom come; that His will may be done, and the great clusters stream from heaven to earth. Let us pray with earnest longing for the continual supply of life from the stem we are branches of; that it may flow back into what is withered, and revive what is almost dead. Let us entreat the great husbandman to fence and defend His Vine; and to cleanse and prune us, however painfully—if it be His will—that we may go—while remaining fast in the Vine yet go—each as he is called to his own duty, and bear fruit; and that our fruit may abide.

INAUGURATION OF JOSHUA'S LEADERSHIP.

THE PASSAGE OVER JORDAN.

BY REV. BENJAMIN HUNTER, B.A., VICAR OF
AUKBOROUGH, DONCASTER.

SERMON PREACHED AT AUKBOROUGH, ON THE
FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

"And the priests that bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, and all the Israelites passed over on dry ground, until the people were passed clean over Jordan."—JOSHUA iii. 17.

THE History of the children of Israel under Moses was one great epoch of the nation; under his leadership they went into the wilderness a group of families, and came out a nation; in the wilderness under Moses, their great legislator, the nation had its birth.

And now the new-born nation wants a home, a place of settlement. This could not be obtained without hard fighting; such fighting as, forty years

ago, the just escaped bondmen had no relish for. They then were too cowed in spirit, too feeble-hearted for this work. But forty years' wanderings in the wilderness had inured them to hardship; the race of bondmen had, within that period, passed away, and a new generation, seasoned by endurance and not unpractised in at least desultory warfare by the way, grew up ready for the new task divinely imposed on them.

Moses, however, was dead; and a new leader, who shall command their affections and deserve their respect, must be appointed to the office of general over this new-born nation of soldiers. To this office, Joshua, one of two who, leaving Egypt with Moses, alone survived to reach the Jordan, had for some time been designated by divine arrangement.

But it was needful at this important stage of the nation's history, that his selection by God should be clearly, unmistakably, and publicly declared.

Thus would appear the necessity for the great miracle, an account of which is contained in this and the following chapter.

Miracles were not, and are not an ordinary accompaniment of a divine mission. St. John the Baptist, we know, did no miracle, yet he was sent of God. The priests under the Old Testament dispensation were not as a rule able to exercise miraculous power. The ministries in the Church at the present day, at least in our portion of it, claim no such power. Only extraordinary ambassadors sent forth, as it were, from heaven on some special mission, needed to be accredited in this unusual way.

Moses, who had been sent to an enslaved people to rouse them to effort, was armed with these credentials, miracles were ordered to be performed both before the people and their oppressor to attest the authority committed to him by God. A new era had opened to them, and it demanded a special provision. So with this second era, recounted in the book of Joshua. No child of Moses was about to continue the work begun by him; it was a work requiring special qualifications; a mere successor could not, by following in the same lines, make the new future all plain sailing; the priests, successors as they were of Aaron, were not born soldiers, nor generals. This being so and Joshua being the selected instrument, his authority must be attested in some remarkable manner which would unmistakably point him out before all the nation as "the man" for "the task."

And thus we have been brought step by step to see the reason for the miracle of which this chapter gives an account. Granted, as we Christians do grant, and as a believer in God's omnipotence cannot but grant, that a miracle is possible; we yet must feel it due to the sense of reverence we owe to our Almighty God, that the occasion for the miracle should be such as to demand the divine interposition. Facts, as we understand them, do

not lead us to expect the daily occurrence of miracles. Stories we have read in some of the legends of the saints almost betray their own untruthfulness, as when, for the most trivial reason, or to get a person out of the most ordinary difficulty, a miracle is said to have been performed. The alleged miracles of the Romish Church such as those of our Lady at Lourdes, are of this class. It is not scepticism, it is not infidelity, which leads us to doubt these. Our very reverence for God, a divine being, who shows to us that He acts by law, teaches us that He will not, however great His power be, bring in a higher law unless the need for it in His judgment, be clear and unmistakable.

And this rule we may apply to all epochs of miracles. Take the two Christian epochs, the one which was to mark our Lord as the Son of God, the Messiah sent to complete or fulfil prophecy and type, and to deliver a lost world; the other, which was sent to attest the claims of our Lord and His Apostles, whose office it would be to uproot heathendom, and to give an entirely new interpretation to all popular Jewish aspirations; whose mission almost seemed to be to overturn the religion which had been handed down to the Jews by God.

The miracle which this chapter relates, is a marvellous instance of nature owning the sovereignty of her Lord. The salt sea had at the word of Moses divided hither and thither to make a passage for God's people; and now the inland river does the same. That these two miracles, the one inaugurating the leadership of Moses, and the other that of Joshua, are crises in the nation's history we know from the frequent references to them in the Psalms and other prophetic writings. Over and over again, the inspired writers go back to these experiences of the infancy of their nation: "The floods saw Thee and fled; Jordan was driven back."

You have heard (in the appointed lesson) the wonderful story. The priests go forward first, they approach the bank of the river Jordan, the water at this season—barley harvest—stood at its highest, swollen by the rivulets that poured forth from the now melting snowcaps of the mountains. But as the priests go forward, bearing the Ark—symbol of the Divine presence—the river owns her Lord, far away towards Zaretan the waters are heaped up as by some supernatural dam. Was it some earthquake elevating the river-bed at this point, or, which would effect the same result, depressing the bed in a direction northwards towards Zaretan, we cannot tell—the waters running seaward flow on, and soon the course is dry. The priests bearing the ark go to the centre; and, as they stand, the long procession of armed men, camp followers, women and children, file along. No easy task to take these thousands safely across the rocky uneven river bed, with deep descent and steep ascent, and stones and boulders barring the

way. But at last all are "clean passed over." Meanwhile, Joshua has a care that God's honour should be consulted for; in strict accordance with the Divine directions, twelve men representative of the tribes take twelve stones out of the river, and carry them to the other side, that they may set up a memorial of this wondrous passage to be a testimony to their children to come. And after this, twelve stones are piled in the centre of the Jordan bed itself where the priests were standing. When all things were done as God had commanded, then the priests with the ark came up out of Jordan, and, marvel to relate, as soon as they were come up, the Jordan river flows on quietly as ever, and never stopped its course but twice again—years and years later, when Elijah and Elisha crossed it and Elisha returned alone. Earthquake, or whatever the immediate cause, the hand at work to dry the river bed again interposed to bring the stream into its accustomed course.

I have said that one great object of the marvel was the inauguration or open proclamation of Joshua's mission; it is strange that at the same place, or nearly the same place—Bethabara—the House of Passage, the mission of another Joshua, our Lord Jesus, of whom Joshua was but a type, was inaugurated by miracle, though not in the same way. At Jordan, when Jesus was baptised, the heavens clave asunder, and the Spirit descended like a dove on Him, and, lo, a voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The inauguration of Joshua's mission at Jordan brings to mind the inauguration of the greater mission of our Lord Jesus at the same place.

There was a second reason for this miracle. The encouragement of the nation over whom Joshua was now to be captain. To know that God was on their side, that He would fight for them, that however powerful, however numerous, however fortified their enemies were, they had pledged to their cause the Lord on high who was mightier; this would be a strong consolation to those who were soon to be employed as soldiers of the Lord. Fearful hearts would take courage, feeble arms would gather strength, weary feet would tread more firmly.

There was yet another reason for this miracle.

We must remember that what took place at Jordan would be seen from the walls of Jericho, the nearest city of the enemy, which was in full view. For the holders of that fortified city to behold their outer line of defence thus wrested from them by such unexpected and supernatural means were enough to rob them of all heart and hope. Even before this, as Joshua learned through Rahab, their hearts did melt, and the inhabitants of the land were faint because the report had reached them of the Red Sea dried up forty years ago; but now how still more real cause of fear; even as a terror near at hand is more impressive

than one read or heard of. True they had strong walls built up towards heaven; but if the warfare was to be carried on after this sort, what trust could they put in walls against an invader who had at disposal the forces of heaven? We can well understand, then, how the striking terror into the enemy more numerous, more protected, and more powerful than the Israelites could naturally be, might be a third object of this miracle.

I have thus endeavoured to show the importance of this miracle at the passage of Jordan, and how the requirements for Divine interposition in this way seems to be sufficient to satisfy the mind of every candid believer in God's omnipotence.

May I conclude with some reflections for our own guidance?

Whenever we are in great straits let us not doubt God's power and will to aid, so long as we trust in Him. For instance, at the last great struggle, which this passage over Jordan is represented in type by, let us have trust in God; let us be sure that He will (only we have thus far followed His guidance through life)—let us be sure. He will show us Jesus as our Joshua, able, even at our worst straits, to help us.

Next let us be sure also that Satan, our great opponent, is affrighted when he sees our trust in God. The lion's teeth are drawn if he knows a man or woman possess the sentiment, "the Lord is my defence, I will not fear what man shall do to me;" in the words of an old popular hymn—

Satan trembles when he sees
The weakest saint upon his knees.

The wicked, those who oppose the work of Christ, may be sure that no weapon forged against Him or His followers can prosper. They that be with us who trust in God, are more than they that be with them.

Further, we have in this narrative, a strong commendation to the virtue of obedience: the priests obeying God's command were safe, although in the post of greatest danger all the time they stood; the people hasted over; they stood firm. So long as we obey we need not fear.

And, lastly, is not the part which the Ark, the symbol of God's presence, filled in the narrative, an illustration of the part which the Holy Communion—the great seal at the present day of God's presence amongst His people—fills, and ought to fill, in our deliverance and protection. It guards our journey Canaanwards; deprived of it, or depriving ourselves of it, we lose a most important testimony to our safety—we rob ourselves of a great measure of the comfort which Christ is ready to supply to Christian people. Let us, therefore, be sure that this symbol of God's presence is not to be lightly neglected.

WE observe that the Rev. J. T. Hayes, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hinckley, is appointed Vicar of St. Margaret's, Leicester.

Certain 'HARNESS' Cure.

ELECTROPATHIC BELT

FOR

RHEUMATISM

Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"The Electropathic Belt has completely cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."

Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application to Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, the Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**

Only Address, LONDON, W.

52, OXFORD ST. (Corner of Rathbone Place.)

Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1888.

WHAT ARE THE SOCIALISTIC ASPECTS OF "THE IRISH SITUATION?"

AN exhibition in the concrete of what Socialism is and aims at, will prove more effective towards a solution of this urgent problem than any definitions in the abstract, also less fatiguing to follow. And this exhibition is supplied in "the Unanimous Report of the Seattle Grand Jury, May, 1886." Now, Seattle is an important United States City, on Puget's Sound, in Washington Territory, that beautiful section of the Pacific slope. The pretext of the organisation so dealt with, arose from the troubles over Chinese labour, then pouring into the country. It was known as "the Red American Industrial Workmen's Association," and was managed by a secret body, calling themselves "Scientific Socialists," with headquarters at San Francisco, as the central executive. This Association was essentially anarchical in theory and practice. Its main articles ran on arson, robbery, and murder. Its purpose was the overthrow of the existing government, and the erection upon its ruins of a so-called "Socialistic Commonwealth." The first move was to be the confiscation of all property; and its internal policy, to make "the Knights of Labour" mere tools at its disposal. Discontent was to be stirred up on all occasions among the people; and as much strife and agitation as possible fomented by its agents. The working men and their associations were to be freely used and kept in the dark upon the ulterior objects. And this glorious region of the Pacific realm was selected as the field of these devilish designs, by reason of its particular population, natural wealth, and isolated position. Its "secret

and confidential instructions' disclose that "it aims to destroy private ownership in houses, lands, mines, machinery, and all kinds of property. Their first act, once in power, will be the burning of all books, wherein private persons have record of title to lands, etc. The legislative, executive and judicial departments, are to merge in "public functionaries." These "in the name of the people" are to control every affair of life and organise and operate all industries, money is to be superseded by "labour-notes." All machinery, with raw and manufactured materials must be confiscated and distributed "by authority." The press is to work under the same iron control. "The Government" must superintend every affair of life. Further, there were issued "*most secret and confidential instructions*," and these bore upon "the means of practically applying dynamite, seizing armouries and military stores, intercepting troops, imprisoning and destroying influential opponents." Now here was brought to light a gigantic and despotic corporation struggling to establish a baneful mastery, itself cruel and crushing as ever the world withered under. The individual was to be nothing but a slave, a victim, a goose to lay golden eggs and be periodically plucked, then fattened and finally slain if needs be, under a systematic savagery. Such a sight, such a project nowhere appear in any zone of earth; nothing similar or absolutely identical in condition, unless in Ireland only. In Ireland all this is "ditto repeated" in the Land League; item for item, horror for horror, rascality for rascality. And this has dominated with absolute sway, from the date of Mr. Gladstone's advent of power, until Lord Salisbury's deliverance of Ireland began; and curiously and significantly, both systems alike assume in the managers, infallible authority; in the members implicit faith. Both systems irresistibly recall to mind the injunctions found in the "*Secreta Monita*," of the Jesuits, whether by accident or design, it is for this body to explain. And, what if Cardinal Taschereau condemned "the Knights of Labour" in Canada? This touched but the fringes of the net—the Irish and French Roman Catholic artisans. What if the Pope denounced Father McGlynn? He gets his denunciation returned with compound interest added from a Socialistic Priest. Why all this? This involves a retrospect. The origin of Puritanism is traceable to a reaction from the absolutism of the Stuarts and the tyranny of the Anglican Episcopate. And it was under this system that the American citizen La Fayette arose, who crossed the Atlantic to inoculate Roman Catholic France in her prostrate misery and saturated immorality, with the civil and social principles of Puritanism. These were formulated by the Philosophic School into a system; and "liberty, equality and fraternity" became the watchwords of the popular party, to stir into feverish rage the maniacs of the French Revolution. Now, the mutual intercourse

between Ireland and America is but slenderly estimated by the average Englishman, even by the English Press. One must long study its workings and experience its energies in the West and South of Ireland, where, *inter alia*, the returned American immigrant finds himself the object of popular sympathy as the travelled man, and of priestly aversion if not of actual boycotting up to recent dates. One must see this factor again at work upon the Irish mind at the headquarters, say New York and Chicago; where are superadded for the giving and taking of influences, German Atheists, Russian Nihilists, in fact the rascals swept from every European country, as intolerable nuisances. One must also converse on the subject of popular rights and so forth, with the "real Yankee Uncle Sam himself," who will almost fiercely maintain against "the Britishers" that their laws are tainted with despotism and their executive intolerably severe, whereas, what De Jockeville long ago demonstrated, the Republican executive must be far and away more severe than the Monarchical. Then again, all this receives a mighty corroboration from an historical analysis of Modern Irish revolutionary outbreaks or incitements thereto. These run steadily on the descending scale, faster and more furiously towards the lowest grades of socialistic iniquity. Thus, O'Connell appealed to constitutional agitation and denounced the shedding of one drop of man's blood. He gave way bitterly enough to the Poets and Publicists of the Young Ireland School, who sang Rebel Songs not likely to die out, and counselled explosives and street-warfare by God's mercy never realised. Isaac Butt put forth a qualified composition in vain. It slenderly met Irish aspirations or proclivities, being too legal and too dry, promising no stir or fun of robbery and murders, and even gave little scope for wholesale perjury.

Smith O'Brien had covered Irish rebelliousness with everlasting ridicule in the cabbage-garden. Yet, the Romano-Celts held on grimly, and until Head-Centre Stephens added the romance of Secret Societies to the hopes of American sympathy all under one essentially socialistic organisation. But, "the man in the gap" was Mr. Parnell, just because he pushed forward, though with caution, the socialistic principles, which he drank in, while in the arms of his American mother; and which Davitt took and taught from Mr. George as his prophet, and the Land League put in force. Mr. Parnell is the La-Fayette of Ireland, and hence the greatest man, "the Political Pope" of the three kingdoms, at least in Irish estimation.

Now this is the power, these the principles and poor Ireland the blood-field, with which the Pope's chief agents in the Irish Mission have allied themselves, have co-operated so long. These they have fostered, lauded, written and preached up from platform and altar. Yes, principles and an organised power this socialistic combination is, which

through bloodshedding and terrorism is wading to rapine and rebellion.

These agents of the Irish Roman Mission in this career ran counter (to say the least) to the recent Encyclical, to natural humanity to the public conscience of the civilised world, to all except Mr. Gladstone and Leo XIII. And the latter, so far from superseding them, as he had power under "*Pastor Bonus*," to do without either canon law or a trial, to interrupt him, awoke not, stirred not (perhaps he was "a God asleep, or on a journey"), even in the cases of clerical delinquents condemned by the civil tribunals of their country. And this is now the world-claiming Potentate, who comes to the rescue, saving Ireland and obliging England for ever. Would it not be better for his Holiness and "the Inquisition," to inquire into and restrain, as he has not done, his own subjects, and to save their religion from the infamy of detection, as a mere demoralising political engine in the hands of socialists and atheistical vagrants. Has a single Priest or Bishop in Ireland got more than a loose warning—with liberty to interpret the same still more loosely in the light of the political needs, if he pleases—as Archbishop Walsh has intimated to the Lord Mayor of Dublin, and as "the Bishops" in their letter have done, admitting, but extenuating the immorality, because in Ireland the hand stretched forth from the Tiber to help England towards the civil government of Ireland is too feeble to serve in its own spiritual government of Ireland, now all up in arms from the Liffey to the Shannon, and the accomplice is turning informer. It is the voice of too sudden a convert. The Irish would sooner hearken to Richard Weaver. After doing, or letting be done, all the mischief possible by action and inaction through his own accredited and specially chosen agents, Leo intervenes too late for credit of sincerity, too feebly for glory of capacity. And is his Holiness to be marked out for a reward, and get a footing in English politics direct and accredited? And is Cardinal Manning to go to the Lords, as some paper says, with the Methodist Moderator perhaps as his makeweight? No, nor if General Booth was put in the scales as well, will this be endured. One can drop a tear over King Priam, girding on his sword in his palace with Troy in flames. We admire him striking his nerveless blows on the ringing armour of proof, and then dying—a king all over. His soul has our sympathy as it sinks with all but honour lost down to the shades beneath. What of Leo XIII? "He dug a pit and is fallen into the midst of it himself." Who will, of Englishmen, may go down with him. His policy has not helped but hurt the land, even as Ireland. "It is a bad sign of the times. A companion of fools shall be destroyed," is now the notorious condition of his "merrie men." And Ireland has already visibly grown more sour, more secretive in purpose, more ferocious, more

self-reliant, more bent on its socialistic aims than before—nay, talks of "murder" as the final arbitrament, is above all less amenable than ever to any such religious influences as seemed at all to sway her sons. If they still go to confession it will be to confess bloodshedding with about the contrition of the worshippers of Kali, if knavery as the devoted followers of Mercury. Kind Heaven may yet intervene. The Irish Celt may arise and go to his father, and within the walls of Irish parish churches confess, a miserable offender to an Almighty and most merciful Father. To England the crisis brings two or three lessons, first, the alliance of King Henry II. with Pope Adrian for the conquest and enjoyment of Ireland as a joint-stock draw-farin, has been the *fons et origo malorum* for nigh 800 years. If this method begins *da capo* with Queen Victoria and Leo XIII. the last error is worse than the first, because there is no excuse for it. The people of Seattle and other American cities are evidence that the civil power can stamp out the socialistic pest, and much has been done towards this already here at home. And the Celts of this class ought to be known by this time, as they are every one of them born lawyers and play-actors, who will halt in view of the dock and shirk the plank bed. The second lesson is that the cruel and contemptuous policy of Queen Anne's reign after the Williamite victories sowed the seeds which for nearly two centuries have sprung up in dragons' teeth. The truth is that this Parnellite socialism, worse than a long series of strikes, or even an invasion, has deeply impoverished the Irish working population in particular. And, internal improvements, above all tramways in remote districts, now the most disturbed, may at once open communications, restore confidence, and give hope to the hopeless, and food to the hungry. The victims of this socialistic plot may well be pitied, while the prime agents are punished—giving them power, on decentralisation principles rewards them. The third lesson is Roman Catholicism hides itself and its ways and results in England, now chiefly entrapping "silly women" and simple children. What it is and leads to, is now to be seen in Ireland, as in France. Is it a safe system in any view? With its endless capacities of deception has not Providence detected it, and let it exhibit itself as depraving the moral sense of its votaries, and sowing the seeds of retribution in anarchy and socialism. Is this "a religion without morality" to supersede the Church of England, or is the Church of England to be lowered to the same level by the Christendom Unionists?

PHILIP DWYER, A.M.

After the above was despatched, came to hand the important Resolutions of the Irish Roman Catholic Hierarchy on the Roman Decree, with the oily sophistry of *The Freeman's Journal*, and the exultant glorification of *United Ireland*. There

are four resolutions. In the first, the decree is limited and distinguished, as intended to affect the domain of morals alone, and in no way to interfere with politics as such, in this country. "What then?" What else but this? Some ten days ago certain actions (say "the boycott" and "the plan") were assumed in the domain of morals, and "reprobated as immoral and inhuman"; now, "assumed in the domain of politics," these same are neither, but rather sublime and beautiful!! For the opening the eyes of England and of fools who looked for help from Rome in the second Résolution, "the National Movement" is not sought to be "injured," but rather advanced by "the removal of obstacles to its advancement and ultimate success." In the third, "the people are warned" "against the use of hasty and irreverent language." In the fourth, just as men kiss the Pope's feet in St. Peter's, so the Pope, through his Irish agents, kisses the feet of "the leaders of the Irish National Movement for the signal services they have rendered (to what?) to religion"—yes, "to religion." Parallel this base act of servile adulation after searching in all human records—impossible. Balaam, Son of Bosor, for reasons of his own afterwards known, taught the Children of Israel to commit sin; Leo XIII. not only does all this, but goes farther, for he teaches *how to sin without sinning*. May God save Ireland from the demoralising sophistry of the clericalists, now abject slaves of the victorious Parnellites. May God write His laws on many Irish hearts. The Verts and Vaticanists may continue in what Dr. McGlynn calls "most incredible subserviency and most brutal adulation of the Pope." P. D.

EDITORIAL.

IT is our intention to send a free copy of the PULPIT to every clergyman, beneficed or unbeneficed, whose names appear in the "Clergy List" for the year, and who are not already subscribers. Should any of our readers, however, know of any clergyman to whom our publication might be useful, we shall be pleased to supply a copy direct to the address sent to us, at the earliest opportunity.

OWING to the reduction in price of the PULPIT, we again call the attention of our readers to the fact, and point out that the future of this paper must, in a great measure, depend upon the energy and zeal of our present readers, in prevailing upon their friends to become subscribers.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

COLLECT FOR THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

THIS collect is found in Gregory's "Sacramentary," and therefore belongs to that class which was re-

tained after the Reformation. The following is a literal translation of the original: We beseech Thee, O Lord, mercifully hear our prayer, and afford (to us) to whom thou givest a desire of praying, the aid of defence through the Lord. And in this collect we are reminded of that which we should ever bear in mind, viz., that it is the great mercy of God which prompts Him to listen to us at all. He is infinitely high and holy, and we are utterly sinful, and it is indeed a wondrous condescension in Him under such circumstances to hold any intercourse with us. Such a sentiment must have prompted holy men of old to approach God in the language of humble entreaty. So, too, David says, Ps. iv. 1, "Hear me when I call, O God of my righteousness, have mercy upon me and hear me." And again "Praised be God who hath not cast out my prayer nor turned His mercy from me." These words then are not a mere introduction, they require to be absorbed into our every sense whilst approaching Him who is at once our Maker and our God. The petition follows immediately after the short, introductory sentence, and may be divided into two parts.

Firstly, a request for a hearty desire to pray. This desire to pray cannot be attained by any action on our part, nor may it be derived from our own efforts or knowledge. A hearty desire to pray comes from God, for He has said, "I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and of supplication," Zech. xii. 10. A doctrine well borne out by St. Paul, who says, in Rom. viii. 26, that it is the "Spirit" who helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought." This shows us that there is a wrong way of praying and a right one, wrong objects to be asked for and right ones; it is therefore necessary that we should ask for the ability to pray as we ought to do.

We see that the manner of prayer enters into the consideration. The disciples say, "Lord, teach us how to pray"; earnestness is an essential to true praying, and no prayer can be acceptable to God where the words do not proceed from the heart. In Rom. x. i. we read of St. Paul's "*heart's-desire*" and prayer to God for Israel." Where heartiness, leading and constraining us to prayer is found, there the Lord sends His messenger to bless. When was it that God sent Ananias to St. Paul, even then, when he could say of him "Behold, he prayeth." In this frame of mind then we can proceed with the prayer and confidently ask that by God's "might and aid we may be defended and comforted in all dangers and adversities." An essential in prayer is faith, and we are called upon to have faith in the loving protection of God in the spirit and words of the Psalmist to say, "He is my defence. I shall not be moved" (Ps. lxxii. 56). King Asa must have felt thus when he said, "Lord, it is nothing with Thee to help whether with many or with them that have no power; help us, O Lord, our God, for we rest on Thee" (2 Chron. xiv. 11, 12). And such St. Paul too claims as his own experience, and, therefore, that of those who follow in his steps. Under a special danger and adversity of a spiritual kind he "besought the Lord thrice," and here we see his earnestness "that it might depart from him, and received the answer from God, 'My grace is sufficient for thee most gladly, therefore would I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me'" (2 Cor. viii. 9).

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

FUTURE RETRIBUTION.

SIR,—In Mr. Henslow's review of Prebendary Row's work on Retribution, there is a sentence which I do not understand, page 257, 2nd column, line 30. "With regard to πνεῦμα, ψυχή, σῶμα, usually translated spirit, soul and body, he shows the first two are frequently used interchangeably to denote one and the same thing, namely, everything in man which distinguishes him from a mere animal." If it be meant that *spirit* and *soul* are frequently used interchangeably in English, everyone can perceive that; but if it be meant that πνεῦμα and ψυχή are used interchangeably in Greek, there is surely here an error. I should be glad of an explanation; for I think there is not one place in the Greek Testament where πνεῦμα is used, that ψυχή could be substituted; and not one place where ψυχή is used, that πνεῦμα could be substituted.

QUERY.

A SCENE IN THE DUBLIN SYNOD.

SIR,—In your article "A Scene in the Dublin Synod," in the PULPIT of 28th April, a second edition of the pamphlet spoken of is promised. I am now in possession of it. I do not think that the excitement created by the first edition was at all so great as the writer of the article estimates it, and the second has fallen rather flat. Will you allow me to offer a few criticisms?

In the pamphlet, we are told that in the Church of Ireland, the usual act of reverence, by bowing at the name of Jesus in reciting the Apostles' Creed, is not allowed. We are told that the practice of the congregation joining the minister with their voices, in repeating the General Thanksgiving, is a new practice in Ireland. We are told that the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* makes itself responsible for all the correspondence printed in it. We are told that in a paper, read by a Mr. Morley before the Trinity College Theological Society, the doctrine of the spiritualisation of our Lord's Body during the period between His Rising and His Ascending, is advanced. We are told several other things as unsusceptible as the above of defence according to truth.

The chief misrepresentations are about the condition of Trinity College. It is stated that there is, among the divinity students, there, a semi—or whole Romish guild or club; and the authorities are asked why they do not discountenance it. It is true that there are in Trinity a few foolish young men who have taken up the notions of the extreme Ritualistic school. Whether or not they associate themselves together in what they themselves call a guild, I do not know; I think that none but the pamphleteer and one or two more do call it so. But I know that there is no society with any overt corporate existence or individuality of the nature described, so as that the authorities of the divinity school, or of the college, have it in their power to take any notice. In other words, the accusation of the pamphleteer against the college authorities, is that they do not put down a thing that does not exist. Concerning Ritualism in

the college generally, an authority whose name I give you, Mr. Editor, but do not give to the pamphleteer, tells me that there is no advance whatever, during the last ten or more years, in the display of Ritualism and its practices in Trinity College.

The observations of the pamphlet on Mr. Morley's lecture, are so remarkable that I copy them: "It states . . . that our Lord's Body was spiritualised during the forty days, so as no longer to be bound by what is laid down in the 4th Article, or the Black Rubric." The preposterousness of ascribing to the Body of Christ, that it could be subject to rules laid down in rubrics and articles, would be ludicrous did it not rather raise in one's mind an aversion to what seems to me like profanity on the part of the pamphleteer.

The pamphleteer may perhaps attempt to defend his statement, that the reciting of the General Thanksgiving by the congregation is a new practice, by saying what is true, viz., that the practice is newly sanctioned by a rubric of our revised Prayer-Book.

I suppose I need not proceed with my exposure. There would be no occasion to take any notice of this thing, were attention to it confined to Ireland. But when misrepresentations about our Church are thrust on the notice of Englishmen, some corrective seems to be called for.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

Dublin, 26th May, 1888.

[The Editor does not hold himself responsible for all the views set forth under the head of "Correspondence."—ED.]

CORPORAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—I have just seen two utterances which demand notice. First, there is a sermon by Mr. Ponsonby, of Munster Square, on the Feast of Corpus Christi. This, like the writings of the Fathers, is poetical and, to my mind, wholly invertebrate. He speaks of "a too material view," and "that fatal term Transubstantiation," and says that the Fathers made "no attempt to define the manner of the presence," quoting Archbishop Trench and Hooker to the same effect. This hardly agrees with what the *Church Times* has often said, that the Fathers were not even tolerant of a mere presence of spirit, grace or virtue. But the second item is of more consequence. The *Church Times* of the 8th inst., in answer to a theological "Norfolk Gardener," says, "The Black Rubric, as you will see, if you read it carefully, is directed only against the tenet of a physical presence under the natural conditions of a body." What is a physical presence? and what are the natural conditions of a body? What the editor of the *Church Times* means is that the Black Rubric denies only that our Lord's Body, corporally present, retains its attributes of taste, look, feel, smell, etc.; that it allows our Lord's Body to be corporally present, provided those accidents are not asserted. But how does the only argument in the Black Rubric agree with this theory? "It being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." That axiom would not in the least degree affect the question, whether our Lord's Corporal Presence was, or was not accompanied by its accidents. Suppose any one were to say that the sun is corporally in my room, and I were to say that it cannot be physically both in the sky and in my room. Would it not be very absurd to say, that by

hat argument all I meant was to deny that its burning and other powers accompanied its corporal presence in my room? Sometimes the Black Rubric is made out heretical—other times it is said that it virtually enjoins adoration of a corporal presence. Here it is made out to mean nothing at all, as bearing on the axiom, that no material body can be locally in more places than one at one time. It would be much better not to meddle with the Black Rubric or the 4th and 15th Articles. This states as plainly as possible that our Lord's Body is locally fixed in heaven alone; that it has there all the conditions of a material body; that, with or without them, it cannot be present elsewhere, except only by effects; and that, besides His natural Body in Heaven, He has no other, a supposed spiritualised body. C. C.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE LOVING SACRIFICE." London: Griffith, Farran & Co. York: Sampson Brothers. Pp. 116. Price 6d.

MR. BRYAN the writer has aimed at securing a spirit of great devotion in his book, rather than a fine flow of rhetoric. The doctrine of "Real Presence" seems to be the leading principle of its teachings, and no doubt many of the more advanced school of religious thought will find it helpful; at any rate it has the advantage of being couched in simple language—whilst, however, the chapter entitled "Why some keep away" has indisputable truths put in a very practical form, the orthodox reader cannot but take exception to some few statements in it, such as "Perhaps you have never seriously thought why the Prayer Book directs that altar candlesticks 'be retained and be in use,'" p. 58. We fear, too, that Mr. Bryan's argument on p. 57 in favour of "vestments," is a little weak. Many, no doubt, will object strongly to his interpretation of Canon VII. of 1640, and even if he were correct, they would not feel that it was now to be regarded as valid, the doctrine of "prayers for the dead," as plainly set forth on p. 88, at once stamps it as "anti-Protestant," but still any devout reader may gain much of a devotional spirit from an unprejudiced perusal. "The Loving Sacrifice," whilst advocating ritualistic doctrine, is decidedly evangelical in style.

"REMINISCENCES OF WILLIAM ROGERS, RECTOR OF ST. BOTOLPH, BISHOPSGATE." Compiled by R. H. Hadden, Curate of the same. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1888. Pp. 228.

THIS is a very interesting and instructive book, as it tells of real if somewhat secular work, done under what to most men would have been insuperable difficulties by a London clergyman. We are of those who regard sanitary and educational work as purely secular; they are essential handmaids for the development of the moral and spiritual nature of man. The spirit and soul and body of man are so mutually interdependent, that it is impossible during life's career to advance one without a proportionate improvement of the other two. This position is abundantly confirmed by the Bible. We think, therefore, that Mr. Rogers needs no apology when his clerical career was cast amongst so ignorant and depraved a population as the street-sellers of London, for devoting himself heart

and soul to the education of the children and the adults. It is his glory to have gathered 5,000 scholars, and to have collected £1,500 a year in children's pence in schools which he himself built in a district where before there were none. We know that the quality of the education imparted rivalled its quantity. It was far superior to that then given in the surrounding parochial and national. We have heard many a poor parent say that they preferred Mr. Rogers' *pay* schools to the parochial schools where there was nothing to pay, and their children were clothed, and in some instances fed and lodged gratuitously. When we asked why, the answer invariably was, because they got on with the lessons so much better. We believe that the secret of Mr. Rogers' great success was that he insisted upon every parent *paying*, however little, for the education. Few people value, appropriate, and improve what they get for nothing. The district was apparently a very poor one. "It was," he tells us, "a sanctuary and city of refuge for every gang of thieves or fortune-tellers or smashers which the police routed out from every other neighbourhood." "We were all," he says, "ragamuffins. Costermongery was the 'industry' of the place; the district was *Costermongoia*." Costermonger is a term which is now applied to all who get their living by trading in the streets. At the present day every article of merchandise, except intoxicating liquors, can be and is sold in the streets. Although street trading is often, as Mr. Rogers points out, very profitable, it is very demoralising, and ought to be regulated and in a measure restricted by law.

After labouring for eighteen years amongst these costermongers, Mr. Rogers was promoted to Bishopsgate parish, of which he gives a very interesting account in his fourth chapter. He also gives an instructive account of the Royal Commission on Education, on which he laboured for some years. It is interesting to read what he writes about religious instruction. "I take the position that what is generally regarded as religious instruction conduces neither to religion nor to instruction. I cannot imagine anything more absurd than that the teacher should read 'without note or comment,' as it is called, a passage from the Bible, and that the children should be expected to profit by it. The 'without note or comment' people, in their anxiety to ward off proselytism, seem to have forgotten that if there is one book in the world which demands more explanation than another, it is the Bible. And so, if nothing else is possible than such a feeble and useless compromise as this, I would, in the interest of the Bible itself, not have it read at all." Further on he says: "I have grave doubts whether, all things considered, it is worth while to teach the Old Testament at all. I should be satisfied with a thorough knowledge of the Gospel story, and I have a strong conviction that the temptation to the teacher to look upon the subject as a lesson, and nothing but a lesson, is with the New Testament much reduced." With these conclusions no doubt many people will agree, more so than with the doubts he expresses as to the value of writing down the Gospel story, and of examination in religious knowledge.

We can strongly commend these reminiscences to the careful consideration of our readers, especially of those who have to do with schools. Mr. Rogers is a very strong-willed man, and his love of progress is such, that we regret that he did not continue to direct the fortunes of St. Thomas' schools. He would, we

think, have made an admirable headmaster to one of our public schools, such as Eton. We do not approve of all his "movements," some of which he appears to have gone at like an oarsman as he is, *backwards*, without seeing clearly where he was going to. However, he tells the story of his life at Eton and Oxford with singular candour and simplicity, detailing his faults and failures as well as his successes.

THE LONDON SAMARITAN SOCIETY'S NEW HOME AT SANDGATE.—The London Samaritan Society has just established its third Convalescent Home in Sandgate, and the new premises, known as "The Homestead," were formally opened by General Sir Charles and Lady Keyes. The new home, is a convenient and commodious building; it stands in pleasant grounds, overlooks a wide stretch of ocean, and is close to the sea, while it is sheltered from the northerly as well as the easterly winds. Altogether it is most admirably situated for the purposes to which it is intended to be put. The dedicatory service was the occasion of an interesting gathering on the lawn of the Home. Sir Charles Keyes briefly observed that, from his knowledge of the energy which Mr. John James Jones put into any work he took in hand, he felt its success was assured. Mr. J. J. Jones, Director of the Society, gave a sketch of its Convalescent Home work. He said it was suggested to his mind by the face of a poor blind man standing in a crowd he was addressing one Sunday night at Homerton, and commenced by a room being taken at Bognor. It was afterwards established by the taking of a house at Dover, which gave accommodation for twenty-eight beds. That was soon too small, and "Beach Rocks" was taken at Sandgate, and after that a large place at Bournemouth. An extension followed by the taking of "Kinnaird House" at Sandgate, and with the acquisition of "The Homestead" they had that night 185 beds for patients, and they were about adding a home for men at Bournemouth. Lady Keyes, stating it afforded her much pleasure, declared the home open. The Rev. Russell Wakefield, Vicar of Sandgate, then offered a suitable form of prayer for the Divine blessing upon the Institution, and the moving of votes of thanks to Sir Charles and Lady Keyes, who were presented with a beautiful bouquet on behalf of the patients, concluded the proceedings.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this daper.

THE ARMADA COMMEMORATION.—If the meetings which have yet to be held by the Protestant Alliance in Manchester, Oxford, Cambridge, Gloucester, and elsewhere, even faintly resemble those which were last week closed in London, no one will doubt that Mr. A. H. Guinness and his committee will have scored a great success. The commemoration has not proceeded even thus far without most distinctly showing that there is a far stronger and sounder Protestant feeling in London and the provinces than some have lugubriously taken pains to lead people to question.

There have not been wanting those who confidently predicted that dismal failure would attend the meetings of the Alliance. But day after day the attendance increased, the enthusiasm reached a higher pitch, until at the last gathering of the week no one could doubt that the echoes of the key-note which had been so vigorously sounded, would reverberate through the kingdom for many days to come.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adderley, Hon. and Rev. Reginald Edmund, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Christ Church, Oxford, Mission, Poplar; Vicar of Chesterfield.
 Balleine, Rev. George Orange, Dean of Jersey.
 Brinkley, Rev. W. F. B., Vicar of Abbots Leigh, Somerset.
 Browne, Rev. W. B., Vicar of Kingsbridge.
 Calvert, Rev. Charles George, B.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Whitehaven.
 D'Alton, Rev. E. S., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *St. Vincent*.
 Griffiths, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Llanspythid, Brecon, Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Breconshire.
 Harris, Rev. W. S., Chaplain to the *Alexandra*.
 Hayes, Rev. James Thomas, M.A., formerly Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hinckley; Vicar of St. Margaret's, Leicester.
 Hepple, Rev. John Dixon, M.A., Vicar of Branxton, Northumberland; Vicar of Harton, South Shields.
 Hick, Rev. John St. Clere, M.A., Vicar of Netherwitton; Vicar of Witonstall, Northumberland.
 Hoare, Rev. E. N., Vicar of All Saints', Stoneycroft, Liverpool.
 Johnstone, Rev. C. H., late Incumbent of St. Saviour's, Bridge of Allan; Chaplain to the Earl of Mar.
 Lewis, Rev. John T., Master of the Charterhouse, Hull.
 Matthews, Rev. F. J., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Iron Duke*.
 Mitton, Rev. Welbury T., Curate of Rotherham; Incumbent of Birtle, in Manitoba, N.W. Canada.
 Musgrave, Rev. Vernon, Rector of Hascombe and Honorary Canon of Winchester; Proctor in Convocation for the Archdeaconry of Surrey.
 Orlebar, Rev. H. A., Curate-in-Charge of Harbridge, Ringwood.
 Patterson, Rev. Julian E., Curate of St. Andrew's, Bristol; Rector of Hittisleigh, Devon.
 Rainier, Rev. W. V., Chaplain to the *Indus*.
 Sanders, Rev. Frederick Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Brixton, near Plymouth; Rector of Woodleigh, Knightsbridge.
 Williams, Rev. Arthur, Curate of Lostwithiel; Vicar of John's, Devoran.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blacker, Rev. Maxwell Julius, M.A., at 121, St. George's Road, S.W., on the 11th inst., aged 66.
 Conolly, Rev. Marmaduke John, Rector of St. Leonard, Thorpe Malsor, on the 9th inst., in his 61st year.
 Mason, Rev. Richard Williams, M.A., of Plas Bodanof, Anglesey, Rector of Llantrisant, on 2nd inst., aged 70.
 Salisbury, Rev. Elijah Edward Bayle, B.D., Rector of the parish, formerly Curate-in-Charge of Thundersley for twenty-seven years, at Winceby, on the 25th ult., aged 66.
 Shaw-Hellier, Rev. Thomas, formerly Incumbent of Little Compton, Gloucestershire, and Rector of Western Bampfylde, Somerset, at 28, Elm Grove, Hammersmith, on the 19th ult., in his 86th year.
 Scott, Rev. Walter, Curate of Christ Church, Leeds, at Beeston Hill, aged 30 years.
 Thorold, Rev. William, M.A., J.P., forty-six years, Rector of Warkleigh-cum-Scatterleigh, suddenly, Warkleigh, Devon, on the 2nd inst., aged 77.
 Wright, Rev. Richard Robert, M.A., Glebelands, Marhamchurch, on the 29th ult., aged 84.
 Young, Rev. Richard, M.A., Rector of Yeldon (formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford, Vicar of Riseley and Melchbourne, and Rural Dean), on the 5th inst., aged 90.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE USES OF PRAYER.

BY THE VENERABLE EDWIN PALMER, D.D.,
ARCHDEACON OF OXFORD, CANON OF CHRIST
CHURCH.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 22ND, 1888.

"There came a leper and worshipped Him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And Jesus put forth His hand, and touched him, saying, 'I will; be thou clean.' And immediately his leprosy was cleansed."—MATT. viii. 2, 3.

THERE are not a few sentences scattered up and down the Bible which are marvellously adapted to express the cry of the human soul to God. One such sentence is to be found in my text, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean"; another in the narrative of the transfiguration, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." Neither of these, it is true, was in the mouth which first uttered it a prayer in the common sense of the word, because there is no reason to think that either the leper or the father of the demoniac knew our Lord's true nature. Both of them, beyond a doubt, had heard of His miracles; both of them, probably, believed Him, as Nicodemus did, on the evidence of these very miracles, to be a teacher come from God. But there is no reason to suppose that their thoughts rose higher. Perhaps we are led sometimes to forget this by the use of the word "Lord" in our English translation. It means much more in our ears than the word *Kύριε*, which it translates, necessarily conveyed in the time of the evangelists. Our translators themselves usually render *Kύριε* in the Gospels by "Sir" when it is addressed to any other than Christ. Sometimes they render it by "Sir" when it is addressed to Him, as for instance when it is used by the Samaritan woman, by the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, by the nobleman whose son was sick at Capernaum—"Sir, come down ere my child die." There can be no doubt that its meaning in the mouth of the leper in my text, and in the mouth of the father of the demoniac, was the same as in the mouth of that nobleman. In the mouths of the disciples it expressed reverence, and not mere courtesy, but still it need not have meant more than was conveyed by the Hebrew designation Rabbi. Indeed this meaning is suggested by Christ's own words, "Ye call me Master and Lord (*ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ*

Κύριος), and ye say well, for so I am." Yet for them, its meaning would rise as they gained a deeper insight into our Lord's true character. He was more to them than their teacher whom they acknowledged to be "the Christ, the Son of the living God." The exclamation of St. Thomas after His resurrection, "My Lord and my God," seems to lift it into the sense in which we use it now. No such sense, however, we may be sure, was in the mind of the poor leper, when he cried out to the prophet of whose miracles he had heard, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." His words were not intended as a prayer to God, but as an entreaty for help to one with whom he believed God to be.

Yet, though it is right that we should remember this, surely no words ever came from a man's mouth fitter to be addressed to God in prayer: first, because of man's uncleanness, and then because of his inability to cleanse himself. There is no need to quote the Old or New Testament to prove the first point, full as they both are of testimonies to it. If original sin is a doctrine which we could not have learned without revelation, it finds a verification in its fitness to explain that strange perversity of the human will, which was known and confessed by men who had never heard of revelation. Strange, indeed, it naturally seemed to the wisest of the heathen, that with the clear light of reason pointing out the road to happiness, the desires of our lower nature should drag the soul about like a slave. There is no need, again, to refer to the crimes which human law undertakes to punish, the crimes of which our newspapers are full—horrible as are the tales of cruelty and of impurity, which are brought from time to time before us. Nor is there need to refer to the various forms of evil which evade the grasp of the law, or which law-givers, in sheer despair, make no attempt to control. Happy he who has had no experience of these things in societies and circles near and dear to himself, in school life, in college life, it may be in his own family and kindred. We all know how they have tainted a large part of literature from the poetry of Greece and Rome to the plays and novels of our own day. All this evidence is with us continually, but there is no need to refer to it. There is, in truth, no need to refer to anything outside our own selves. We all know the evil of our own hearts. Those who look into themselves habitually know it best. The language of great saints, who have seemed to use unreal expressions when they called themselves as St. Paul did, the chief of sinners, is to be accounted for, I suppose, in this way. Their sense of the sinfulness of sin was keener than that of other men, and they did not (like some others) employ that keen sense in estimating the wickedness of their neighbours, but in estimating their own. But all who ever look into themselves—all, indeed, who are not absolutely blind—know

the evil of their own hearts in some degree. Evil of many kinds; evil thoughts, evil words, evil deeds. Words and deeds, it may be, which others have forgotten, or the evil nature of which may not have been perceived by others; cruel, unjust, mean, false, impure. Whose memory is wholly clear of such a stain? And, besides these, far transcending these in number, within us, not without, ever with us, haunting us, tempting us again and again by their recurrence, evil thoughts. "From within," said our great Teacher, "out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man." All these evil things defile the man while they are still within, and have not come forth in the shape of word or deed. And in what heart do not some of them at least spring up, and find entertainment, even if they are not suffered to issue in act? Their birth is of evil; their presence in the heart, though it be only for a single moment, defiles; but it is the toleration of them, the harbouring of them, the consenting to them, which completes the work and makes us sinners, even if, by God's grace, we stop short at this point, and do not carry them out into speech or action. Who can say that he is clean? I am not speaking now of the contrast between God's judgment and man's judgment. Often, indeed, "that which is highly esteemed amongst men is abomination in the sight of God" (Luke xvi. 15). Nor do we always fully know our own sinfulness. Not in vain did the Psalmist say, "Cleanse Thou me from secret faults" (Ps. xix. 12). But I speak now of the contrast between that which we know of ourselves, and that which other men know of us—the witness of our own consciences, and the opinion of the little world in which we live. No doubt men often judge each other unfairly; but often also, I might say always in some measure, because they are unable to see into each other's hearts, they form an estimate from external decency of conduct which is far more favourable than the true character deserves. Who has not felt at times the truth contained in Keble's lines?

For what if heaven for once its searching light
Lent to some partial eye, disclosing all
The rude bad thoughts which in the bosom's night
Wander at large nor heed love's gentle thrall?
Who would not shun the dreary uncouth place,
As if, fond leaning where her infant slept,
A mother's hand a serpent should embrace?
So might we friendless live and die unwept.

It is a humbling thing to a man, when he is a candidate for some post of credit or distinction, to read the testimonials in which his friends set down all that they can say in his favour. The defects of which he is conscious stand out before him in contrast with the one-sided picture which is presented by the testimonials. No less humbling is it for a man—far more deeply humbling if he has a true

conception of sin—to read in his friends' looks and words, and actions, their flattering estimate of his virtue, and (it may be) of his religion, while he is conscious of the evil which is within him. However high a man's credit stands with his fellow-men, his heart knows its own bitterness. The best amongst us feel deeply that it is no unreal form of words in which they ask God's mercy for themselves as "miserable sinners." If this is so with the best, how must it be with those who are making no consistent effort to serve God, but give way to each strong temptation as it comes upon them, or, perhaps, attempt to compound by general decency of conduct for the habitual indulgence of some secret sin! Do we not all need cleansing? Have we not all need to cry with the leper, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean"? He cried for help to God's prophet, as he supposed, because his uncleanness was such as no human skill seemed able to remove. We cry for help to God Himself, Father, Son, or Holy Ghost (for the Three are One)—we cry for help to God Himself, because we have learnt by bitter experience that we cannot cleanse ourselves, or one another. There is One, and One only, who, if He will, can make us clean. Not, of course, that we substitute prayer to God for all effort on our own part. That would be nothing else but to mock God, to whom we pray. No doubt, as all good things are abused in their turn, and as there is no limit to the indulgence of private fancy, even in matters of religion, there is a sect which deems it a dishonour to God to use any remedy but prayer for bodily disease. But such fancies are foreign to the mind of the Church Catholic, and indeed to the thought and practice of the vast majority of men who call themselves Christians. When men pray to God heartily for things to which they seem able to contribute at all themselves, they do also everything that is in their power for the attainment of that object for which they pray; whether it be for daily bread, or recovery from sickness, or anything else that concerns the body, or for deliverance from spiritual enemies, for reformation, for purity of soul. As men who ask the help of their fellow-men know that they cannot expect to obtain it, unless they exert themselves also for that object which they seek, so those to whom prayer is a reality know that, so far as their power goes, God expects them to work together with Him. But as there are some who in the case of bodily sickness refuse the help of human skill, and rely on prayer to God only, so there are others who bid us rely on human skill alone, and abandon prayer. I do not speak of those who tell us that there is no God, or that we cannot be sure that there is a God, but of those who insist upon the uniformity of nature, the invariable sequence of cause and effect, and argue that there is in consequence no room for prayer, because all things must needs turn out according

to laws fixed and unchangeable. Yet, if this argument is conclusive and leaves no room for prayer, it is hard to see what room it leaves for human skill, human effort, human choice. If all events are really determined by necessary laws, it is of no importance that any man should choose this or that course of action. The final result will in any case be the same, whether we do evil or do good, whether we set ourselves to develop our own capacities, and use them to the uttermost of our power, and according to our best judgment, or sit with arms folded and allow ourselves to drift along according to every passing impulse which moves us; our activity or our inactivity will make no difference to our own happiness or to the course of the world. But all men, or well-nigh all, show by their conduct that they do not accept these conclusions. As Bishop Butler observed long ago, whatever be the weight allowed to the opinion of necessity in the region of speculation, "yet, with regard to practice, it is as if it were false, so far as our experience reaches." We all act, educated and uneducated, unphilosophical men and philosophers, as if no such opinion existed. We choose this or that course, with a full belief in our own freedom of choice; we exert ourselves at the cost of toil and pain to attain objects which we believe we shall not attain without such exertion: we advise others, we persuade them, we constrain them by laws and penalties, to govern their actions in the way which we believe to be most conducive to the welfare of each individual man, and of the community of which he forms a part. And this we do as constantly, as unhesitatingly, as if no idea of necessity existed. In short, in almost everything that we say or do, we assume that the human will is a true factor in the course of the world, and that human happiness and human progress depend in great measure upon its direction. If this be so—if we must needs in spite of all speculation treat the will of man as free and as a contributor to results which affect the body and affect the soul, it is hard to see on what ground we can refuse a place in our practical system to the will of God. Men may entangle themselves in mazes of speculation, whether they start from the theological doctrine of God's foreknowledge, or from the theory of natural law. They may find it difficult to explain how on that doctrine or that theory there is room for the operation of God's gracious will in answer to prayer, as they may find it difficult to explain how on the same doctrine or on the same theory the exertion of the human will can have any influence on the course of events. But if they follow, and must needs follow, wise or simple, their own instinct and the general tradition of mankind, in exerting themselves as if they were free agents, is it not equally reasonable for them to follow their own instinct, and the general tradition of mankind, in crying to God for a blessing upon their exertions? I say

nothing about the direct teaching of Scripture, which in this matter as in others—as for instance in the great question of moral right and wrong—gives express and authoritative sanction to the promptings of the human heart. We have not been wrong, nor our fathers, when we have followed this instinct, this tradition, this authority. We have not been wrong, we are not wrong, in asking the help of God in all our efforts, in bringing before him all our needs—temporal and spiritual. Only, when we invoke the help of God, we must always remember what is the nature of His will. We must remember—though few, one would think, can be in danger of forgetting this—that His will is all holy and all pure, and that it is impossible for Him to grant an unrighteous prayer. We must remember—what it is far easier to forget in practice—that His will is determined by infinite wisdom, while we often do not see clearly what tends to our own happiness, and can never see perfectly what might be the effect upon the happiness of our neighbours, or upon interests wider still, of the fulfilment of our private wishes. And, therefore, in all our prayers we should endeavour to keep the thought always with us to which our blessed Lord gave utterance at Gethsemane, "Not my will, but thine, be done." If we can do this, while we do this, let us not shrink from pouring out our whole hearts before God. We shall find in this habit a source of comfort, and a source of improvement. Our earthly desires will be purified, our passionate longings chastened, our impatience curbed, when we lay open our hearts in God's presence. Let us bring, then, all our desires to God. But, most of all, let us bring to Him with confidence our desires for conformity to His holiness. "Lord if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." We know, St. John says, that when our Lord shall appear again, "we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." "And every man," he goes on, who hath this hope in Him, purifieth himself, even as He is pure." Let us hold this hope fast, and set ours wills to do this thing of which St. John speaks. Let us strive after purity, in thought, and word, and deed; purity of the heart, and of the affections; purity of tongue, purity of life. And while we thus strive, let us remember that, however ineffectual we may feel our own efforts to be, we have a mighty helper if we will but trust to Him; a helper who will not fail to hear this prayer, if we make it honestly and humbly; a helper with whose will this prayer certainly is in accordance. "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." The voice which cleansed the leper is ever ready to speak healing and comfort to our hearts.

On the 15th inst., St. Stephen's, Walbrook, was reopened after restoration. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of Marlborough.

THE GOSPEL FOR THE FIRST CENTURY,
THE GOSPEL FOR THE NINETEENTH.

BY THE REV. JAMES A. CARR, M.A., LL.D.,
VICAR OF WHITECHURCH, DUBLIN.

SERMON PREACHED AT WHITECHURCH ON
JUNE 19TH, 1887.

[*The quotations in this Sermon are from the Revised Version.*]

"His name through faith in His name hath made this man strong."—ACTS iii. 16.

THE Miracle recorded at the beginning of this chapter (which some of you may remember, was read as the second Lesson on last Sunday morning), very fitly and forcibly sets before us the great purpose subserved by miracles at the first preaching of the Gospel. In our Lord's case, His miracles were something more than wonders more than signs, they were very frequently moral and spiritual lessons. They not only arrested, they taught and illustrated oftentimes in a very striking and effective manner, some great principles of the heavenly kingdom. For example, when He said to the blind man, "Go, wash in the Pool of Siloam," we have put before us at once the benefits to be derived from faith, showing itself in obedience. The man did as Christ bade him to do, he acted with a childlike trust and got the reward which always follows on such a temper of mind—he came back seeing. There is hardly one, if indeed any, of our Lord's miracles in which we may not see talent, some deep spiritual lesson. But this is not the case with regard to the miracles wrought by the Apostles; these are to be regarded rather in the light of signs and wonders which were to prepare the way for the preaching of the Gospel. Now this healing of the lame man at the gate of the temple, is very much a case, in point. Peter and John are going up quietly to the temple, nobody is noticing them. How are they to get an audience for the message they have to deliver, and an audience that will be sufficiently interested to listen to them? If they begin to preach just as they are, unknown, and uninfluential men, they will carry no weight with them, and perhaps will be arrested by the authorities before they can get a hearing at all. Here it is, that this miracle of healing has its proper place in the new economy of things. The healing of this lame man as he lies at the temple gate, in the sight of all men, at once excites interest, and draws a crowd together. The Apostles can now speak with authority. They have healed the man, "in the name of Jesus Christ." This gives them a starting-point for their after discourse, and an opportunity for bringing forward the message of salvation with which they have been entrusted. It is obvious to remark that had the two Apostles been worldly and interested men they had now a splendid opportunity for magnifying themselves at the expense of their cause. They could have

taken credit to themselves for the miracle, and ingratiated themselves with the multitude at the expense of their Master. But they are not the men to do this; on the contrary, they seize on the immense interest with which they are all at once invested in the eyes of the wondering multitude, to turn their thoughts to JESUS CHRIST. The miracle is a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not; it serves its purpose well, by opening a door for the preaching of the Gospel. And so they proceed: "Ye men of Israel why marvel ye at this man, or why fasten ye your eyes on us, as though by our own power or Godliness we had made him to walk. The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers hath glorified His Servant Jesus, whom ye delivered up and denied before the face of Pilate, when he had determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy and the Righteous one, and asked for a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead whereof we are witnesses. And by faith in His name, hath His name made this man strong whom ye behold and know, ye the faith which is through Him, hath given Him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all." Here was a fine opening for the preaching of the Gospel in that very city where our Lord had been crucified but a short time before, and you see how the Apostles took advantage of it.

But we may learn a good deal from the style of the address delivered by St. Peter on this occasion. An excited and interested audience was before him, and the Apostle had to make the most of his opportunity. True, a heinous crime had been committed but a short time before in the city of Jerusalem; Christ had been crucified, but you will perceive that notwithstanding this, there is no harsh upbraiding in the language of the Apostle. He had to speak plainly enough as to facts. They had "delivered up God's servant, and denied Him before the face of Pilate, and asked for a murderer in His place, and had denied the Holy and Righteous one." All this was true, but nevertheless there is no harshness in the language of the speaker. Scolding people because they have done wrong never mends matters. No one is ever made better by fault-finding and passing severe judgment on them. Speaking the truth in love is a much better principle, and a much more certain way of winning human hearts. It is God's way. God speaks to us in love, He speaks to us in the Son of His love; where our sin abounds, God's grace doth much more abound. As the Apostle says, "Herein is love, not that we loved God but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." This was God's way with us from the beginning. When man sinned, instead of crushing him, God had a message of mercy for him, He opened the door of hope and did not leave him to perish in his misery and sin. Oh, brethren, how good is God to us in this respect, how lovingly

does He invite us to return to Him, promising to receive us back to His favour as the father in the parable received back his poor prodigal son. "Turn ye, turn ye; why will ye die? Return unto me, for I have redeemed thee." "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth." This is the way that God seeks to win men back to Himself, and we may be quite certain that, following God's plan, this is the best way for poor sinful weak men to deal with their erring brethren. Harsh judgments never do any good. And this is eminently the plan adopted by St. Peter in this address. He seeks to win his audience by gentleness, by assuring them of the goodwill of God towards them, notwithstanding the enormity of their crime. He says, "I wot that in ignorance ye did it as did also your rulers." He tells them "to repent and turn again, that their sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord," and he winds up by telling them that they "are the sons of the Prophets and of the Covenant which God made with their fathers," and says thus: "Unto you first God having raised up His servant sent Him to bless you in turning away every one of you from your iniquities." Could anything be more constraining, more affecting? Now you will perceive that this address breathes the very spirit of Jesus Christ. When we find the Apostle saying to the people, "I wot that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers," we call to mind at once the words of our Saviour on the cross—"Father forgive them for they know not what they do." It is hard not to believe that St. Peter had these very words of our Lord ringing in his ears when he told the people that he knew it was in ignorance they had put Jesus Christ to death. Again see how faithful he is to the spirit of Christ when he says, "Repent ye, therefore, and turn again that your sins may be blotted out." What was this but a faithful adhesion to the commission given to the Twelve by their ascending Lord from the Mount of Olives to the effect that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem?" Nor does he fail likewise to exalt that Name which is above every name; it is in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth he bids the lame man to walk; it is by faith in His Name that His Name hath made this man strong, and the Divine Name is openly and boldly declared as "the Christ, even Jesus whom the heavens must receive (you see he is breathing the very atmosphere of the Ascension) until the time of restoration of all things whereof God spake by the mouth of all His holy prophets which have been since the world began."

More, indeed, we might learn from this address of the Apostle, but this will be sufficient if we observe that the message has been the same from the beginning. We preach no new doctrine,

brethren. There was not one Gospel for the first century and another, and a very different Gospel for the nineteenth century. The spiritual needs of men, and the healing provided by the Divine pity are constant things. We still preach Christ crucified; we go back to the beginning and we say with our Lord, "the Kingdom of heaven is at hand; repent ye, therefore, and believe the Gospel." The same glad tidings that were proclaimed that day in Jerusalem by the lips of St. Peter are made known to you to-day. Repentance and the remission of sins are preached to you once more as at the beginning; the duty of turning to God with your whole heart under the sense of your sin and your need, turning to that gracious Saviour who says to you so lovingly, as once he spake on earth, "come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Dear brethren try the efficacy of the Saviour's Blood. Seek that justification which is even for the most unworthy, though the merits and righteousness of Jesus Christ, and having been "washed, sanctified, and justified," you will find yourselves like the lame man that was healed at the "beautiful gate," and like him you will be ready to enter the temple, "walking, and leaping, and praising God."

NOTES FOR CHILDREN'S SERMON.

BY THE REV. H. G. ROSEDALE.

Suitable for Fifth Sunday after Trinity.

"THE DRAUGHT OF FISHES."

PICTURE.—People crowding round Jesus. Why? Because He had something good to give them, as He has to give us (they no doubt listened attentively. *Illustrate*—Children clustering round anyone who has anything good to give away—so, too, we must come to Him for all that is worth having). At last He leaves them and gets into a boat and asks Peter to push out. Then "let down your net"—Peter's answer showing that his faith overcame his own inclination and ideas—the result—the abundant reward.

LESSON. THE REWARD OF OBEDIENCE.—God loves obedience and always rewards it. It is a word to be written on the heart of each child. *Illustrate*—Abraham.—God hates disobedience and always punishes it. *Illustrate*—Saul and the Amalekites.—Do we wish for rewards or punishment? Rewards, then we must obey! Whom? God.

If we wish to obey Him we must "in the Lord" obey.

1. Parents. (Col. iii. 20), (Prov. i. 8). This is the first meaning of the fifth commandment. Reward of obeying parents makes home happy, makes after-life happy. *Anecdote*—Boy standing

on platform—hat blows off—jumps on to line and train seen coming—no time to move away—father says “lie down flat, my son”—boy does so—train passes over—life saved—sent for by the queen, and openly rewarded for obedience.

2. Superiors. (1 Peter ii. 13), (Heb. xiii. 17), (Col. iii. 22), *vide* “Duty to our neighbour.” Some do not care to be respectful to superiors—allude to conduct of boys and girls in street, church, school—rude and disobedient sometimes. That is *not* the way to get a reward. *Anecdote*—Rich man died not long ago, and told how he became so rich and great. His elder brother was cleverer, stronger, etc., than himself, but did not know how to obey and so lost place after place, and would have been a beggar but for what he gave him. “I am rich to-day,” said he, “because I always followed my Bible’s teaching, and was respectful and obedient to those put over, and superior to, me.”

3. Teachers. (1 Thess. v. 12.) By teachers we mean all those who teach us anything. We mean that boys and girls must do as they are told in church, in Sunday school, in day school. Children in Roman Catholic countries are so obedient to their spiritual teachers, *they* will have and do have their reward. *Illustrate*—Labours of teachers for the good of their pupils.

We must do these three things to obey God, if we want a reward and not punishment.

WHY BISHOP WALSHAM HOW LEFT LONDON.

THE Bishop of Wakefield, at a luncheon given in his honour at Halifax, said: “When the Queen did me the honour of asking me to take the Bishopric of Manchester, I wrote by return of post to Lord Salisbury, saying that I had given my heart and life to East London. At that time I was in the position in which the late Bishop of London had placed me—namely, in charge of a definite district in East London with a large delegated authority, patronage and an almost independent position. Within a month after my refusal of Manchester the present Bishop of London very much changed my position. He told me that he felt it his bounden duty before God to superintend the whole of the diocese equally; that he could not, therefore, any longer recognise my position as confined to East London, but that I must do work all over the diocese. I think the Bishop, being a very strong man, who is never tired of work, and finding the power within him to grapple with more work than his predecessors, was right in saying, ‘Here is East London, one of the most interesting parts of my diocese, I cannot leave that to another.’ He spoke very kindly, but things were very different from that time; my position became much changed, and I was, as Lord Salisbury said, set free by the action of another from the sense that I had before entertained of my duty to live and die in East London.”

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE**, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C.B. HARNESS Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains **ADVICE HOW** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation. **OBESITY IS CURED** in a pleasant, **gratis and post free**, on application to the

Medical Battery Company, Limited,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1888.

MISSIONARY BROTHERHOODS.

IT has often been asserted that Church Congresses have had their day, and have done their work, and that there is very little more that they can do, some of the subjects being worn completely threadbare. But judging from the programme of the ensuing Manchester Church Congress, it would appear that this charge will hardly hold good, for among the practical subjects we find Betting and Gambling, and for the working-men’s meeting subjects which must be interesting for them, subjects dealing with Christian Evidences, Positivism, etc. But one of the most important is that of “Communities for Men,” or, as we prefer to call it, Brotherhoods for Missionary Work at home and abroad.

That the Church of England is rising to the sense of her great responsibilities with regard to the work of missions is a cheering fact; already we see great extensions of missionary activity, nearly every year some new See is formed, and a Bishop consecrated, while, on the other hand, we find men giving up prospects at home in order to spend and be spent in the service of the Divine Master. And when some brave missionary dies, or is murdered at his post, like Bishop Hannington, others are ready to take the work which has been begun. On the other side, it seems most important that we should not depend so much on isolated missions or on individual effort, but should the rather try to establish, as far as possible, Communities of Men or Brotherhoods in certain places, who should make their centre, and from this centre extend their operations according as time and opportunity presents itself. And this we take it was the way

in which the earlier missionaries in this country carried out their work; we have only to think of St. Columba and his followers, how they worked in Scotland, but their home was at Iona, or of St. Cuthbert and others, with their home at Lindisfarne. And so it would seem this plan has not only the precedent of antiquity, but is admirably suited for the present day. And if this plan had been carried out in earlier days of missionary zeal, much ground might have been gained and possibly more converts made. We are told that at one place in Sierra Leone, there is the churchyard full of graves of missionaries who have come out, and have succumbed to the climate; that Sierra Leone is called "the white man's grave." This, of course, raises the question of a native ministry, and we believe that in such countries, if Christianity is to have any power, it must be by raising up and educating the natives to take the place of pastors and even bishops. Only a few weeks ago we saw the announcement of the death from fever of Bishop Parker and a Mr. Blackburne, in Equatorial Africa; and at the meeting of the Central African Mission, only the other day, Bishop Smythies stated that the region where Bishop Parker's work lay was a most malarious district. With such statements it seems a pertinent question to ask: Are we to go on sacrificing valuable lives and not the rather train up natives who shall be able to live in the country, and so in this way influence them? We commend this problem to the grave consideration of the committees of the Church Missionary Society, and the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

Further, the establishment of Missionary Brotherhoods will do a great deal to break down the isolation of missionaries, many of whom are working single-handed, far away from any centre of life and activity; and a man needs an immense amount of spiritual power on the one hand, and of resource in himself on the other, to keep his spirits up. And even the best of men are apt to flag under such circumstances, and to grow gloomy and take a melancholy view of things. We have heard of men labouring on for years in India, or in the wilds of North-West Canada, or in wide parishes on the iron rock-bound coasts of Newfoundland. Hence the establishment of Missionary Brotherhoods will do much to strengthen the ties of true friendship, and because they are living in community will not lose touch with the men they wish to influence.

But there is one danger; many men will engage in such work from the highest motives, and become almost ascetics in their manner of life. Some doubtless will remember the establishment of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta. The Mission did well at the first, and the members prosecuted their work with much zeal, aiming at high living and high thinking; so much so, that we have been told that they did without several things which are considered to be necessary for existence in a

country like India. Their object was to show the high-caste Brahmins that Christians could live self-denying lives, could enter into their intellectual difficulties, and yet show them the more excellent way; but it was found that several of them could not stand the physical and mental strain, and, in consequence, the health of many gave way. Asceticism may do very well in a country where the climate and other things do not place overwhelming obstacles, and therefore, while we admire the self-denying, noble purpose of men who try to show the higher and holier side of life, we question whether by stretching the cord too tight there is not the danger of breaking, and, in trying to lead men on to higher truths, would it not be wise to forbear taxing the physical and mental powers too much?

We have hitherto been speaking about missionary work abroad, but we must not forget that there is mission work at home, among the teeming masses of population. How Missionary Brotherhoods are to help this work must be discussed at another time.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST.

Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.—ST. LUKE xxii. 19;
ST. PAUL I COR. xi. 24.

A PAPER BY THE REV. F. TILNEY BASSETT,
M.A., PREBENDARY OF WELLS AND VICAR OF
DULVERTON.

It has often been observed, and the more frequently the observation is made the more painfully is the truth felt, that one of the saddest features in the history of exegesis and doctrine is that the sacrament of peace and love should have been for the last thousand years made the occasion of the hottest strife, the arena in which the fagot has been kindled and the blood of martyrs spilt, and the shrine in which superstition has intruded additions, and from which Rationalism has withdrawn the "beauty and glory" of the original investiture. The confusion that is bred of controversy, the one-sidedness that is the offspring of party, the following of favourite leaders, and the extravagance of argument and advocacy on all sides, have brought about the lamentable result that the ordinance which Christ instituted for union has become the cause of disunion, and the girdle that should have braced all the members of the body together in unity of life and action, is turned into a dissecting knife to sever them hopelessly one from another. The object of the present paper is to avoid, if possible, all foregone conclusions, to eliminate all party prejudices, to be swayed neither to the right hand nor the left by personal feelings or pre-conceived opinions, whether they be the outcome of the training of early days or the influences of after years, but simply to search the testimony of Holy Writ under the guidance of grammar, lexicon, and parallel passages, in order to gather evidence and submit the case to our readers to pass their verdict and sentence according to the laws that should govern critical inquiry and conclusions.

There is no argument needed to prove, because it is admitted by all, that the Eucharist under the Christian dispensation was based by its Divine Founder Himself upon the Jewish Passover, and that the chief of feasts under the old covenant was superseded by the chief of sacraments under the new covenant. The following passages settle this matter. "Go," said our Lord, according to St. Luke, who gives the fullest account, to His disciples Peter and John, "and prepare us the Passover, that we may eat." A sign was given them to mark out the person whose house was to be honoured with the presence of the Lord, and the message to be delivered to him was, "Where is the guest-chamber where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples." "And they made ready the Passover." And when seated at the feast He said, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer, for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it (*i.e.*, the Passover) be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." (Luke xxii. 8-16.) It was at this feast that He instituted the Eucharist, or, we would rather say, transfigured the Jewish Passover into the Christian Eucharist, when He took the loaf, the well-known "hidden manna" loaf that was first concealed on the table, then produced and broken by the master of the house, and distributed among the members of the family; and afterwards He took the cup, the third of the four cups that graced the feast, known as the "cup of blessing," and uttered the ever-memorable words which have been preserved to us, with slight modifications, and subject to some subordinate different readings which do not concern our present inquiry, by the three Synoptic evangelists and by St. Paul, who received the knowledge of them afterwards by revelation, which may be summarised in the important facts that the Lord took the bread, broke it, and blessed it, and said, "Take, eat, this is my Body." And then the cup with the words, "This is my blood of the new covenant," and closed each act according to the testimony of St. Paul with the charge, "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν," words which have received a somewhat indefinite and inadequate rendering in our English versions: "Do this (this do) in remembrance of Me." (A. V. and R. V.)

In dealing with a difficult text, whether the difficulty is found in the doctrine contained in it, or in the grammatical constructions, or in the force of the words that compose it, no small advantage is gained if we can discover a parallel passage which presents us with similar features, but if we can find a ground-text to which the passage that perplexes us can trace its origin, and from which it is directly derived, we gain a long stride in the journey of investigation, and have fair hopes of ending our efforts in a successful discovery.

We have said above that it is beyond all controversy that the Eucharist was founded by our Lord upon the basis of the Passover feast. We are therefore at once remitted to the institution of that festival in the 12th chapter of Exodus. After revealing to Moses all the laws that should regulate the ceremonial of the ordinance, the time of its observation, the specialities of the sacrifice, the sprinkling of blood, the partaking of its flesh and its accompaniments, the Lord winds up the category of commands with the words, "All the congregation of Israel shall keep it," v. 47. Let us read the words in the original, בְּלִיעֶדָה יִשְׁרָאֵל יֵעָשֶׂה אֹתוֹ. Let us translate them literally, "All the congregation

of Israel shall *do* it." The instant that this word "do" sounds in our ears we catch the connection between the charge of Jehovah to Moses and the charge of our Lord to His disciples, "This do." The one a divine injunction respecting the type, the other an equally divine injunction respecting the antitype. We may therefore venture to expand the commandment of our Lord into words which appear to be the unmistakable purport of His utterance:—"Hitherto ye have, according to the old law and covenant, kept the feast of the Passover as a memorial of the deliverance of your forefathers from "the land of Egypt and the house of bondage," with all the acts of love and mercy that accompanied that redemption of Israel on their birthday, as a nation, with life and liberty. Now a new epoch in the history of Israel dates its commencement, the law is blooming into the Gospel of the Messiah, the old covenant is unfolding into the greater glory of the new covenant. As the lamb was slain, and its blood sprinkled on the tents of Israel for acceptance and salvation on that night of "mercy and judgment," so is now "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" to be sacrificed and slain, and His Blood shed for the remission of sins. And as the former deliverance was perpetuated in all your generations by a feast, in which the features of the divine interposition in your behalf and of your emancipation were reproduced and remembered, so in future are you and your successors in the new dispensation to observe this ordinance, which is based upon, and is the antitypical outgrowth of, the original one, in which your redemption from a more grievous bondage and your emancipation into liberty, and the ratifying of the covenant of eternal life are to be celebrated and commemorated for ever. This Passover have ye hitherto *done* in remembrance of your salvation from Egypt. This *do* ye now and for ever in remembrance of Me and the salvation I have wrought for you."

The reciprocal relations between type and antitype may be summarised in a few words. The type is an enigma, in which the *data* of a secret are furnished, but the secret itself is concealed; or a mystery in which we are permitted to see the drapery that vests and outlines the form, but the form itself is withheld from our gaze; and the antitype is the solution of, and full answer to, the enigma, and the revelation or unveiling of the mystery; the one is the parable and the other its interpretation. And yet we are not to suppose that it is a purposeless providence that has preserved to us the word or act-painting of the ancient types, because the tints and shadows, the minute particularity of the delineation, the perspective and relative proportions of the picture, will throw a marvellous light upon the reality when subjected to our examination. The fitness and fulness of the answer is never so well seen as when the terms and construction of the enigma are closely scrutinised. Leviticus, to exemplify our meaning, would be unintelligible without the Gospel, but we must all admit that the Gospel is illustrated and illumined by Leviticus, and the deepest doctrines and holiest consolation are derived from the figures that forestalled and the shadows that were cast before the appearance of the body and the substance. Further, although the antitype may overlap the precincts of the type, it must contain all that the type embraces; maturity outstrips childhood, but does not ignore it; growth is a progression and a development, and not a contravention; hence whatever terms we find in the type must be

reproduced in the antitype, and the interpretation must advance upon the same lines, though the subject itself may be exalted to a higher sphere, and the "bare grain" be seen to have been the embryo of a golden harvest. Thus, in analysing the words of the text, with which we believe our Lord's words to have had so intimate a connection, we must admit that the meaning of the quotation must be largely influenced by, if not regarded as identical with, the original passage which suggested and supplied its terms. Let us therefore proceed to enter on an examination of the passage in Exodus above referred to, and compare with it the terms of the institution of the Lord's Supper.

The partakers of the Passover are described as "all the congregation of Israel," the exception having been made to the stranger and hired servant being uncircumcised; but all that had accepted the sacrament of initiation, and so were identified with the chosen people, were not only permitted, but commanded to keep the feast. There may possibly be a hint given, in the choice of the word צֹרֵחַ, instead of קָהָל, that the representative body of Israel, the heads of houses, in this case each master of the family of ten, should perform the ceremonial acts, but this cannot be pressed. We come next to the most important word in the whole sentence, the verb which describes the action to be done. With this, for the sake of perspicuity, we must associate its object, יַעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ, *shall keep it*, or rather, *do it*. What is the "it"? אֹתוֹ is emphatic, the sense might have been expressed by a simple suffix, as in the following verse, לַעֲשֹׂהוּ, but the form here is stronger. Now, what is the emphatic "it"? The antecedent is found in v. 43: "This is the ordinance of the Passover"; and in v. 48 this noun is expressed after the verb "do," "when a stranger shall keep (do) the Passover." The passage is therefore equivalent to, "All the congregation of Israel shall keep (do) the Passover." We gather, therefore, that to "do the Passover" is a recognised phrase; and thus we find it in other Scriptures, e.g., Numb. ix. 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14; Deut. xvi. 1; 2 Kings xxiii. 21, 22, 23; and 2 Chron. xxx. 1, 2, 5, and xxxv. 16, 17, 18, 19.

(To be continued.)

EDITORIAL.

It is our intention to send a free copy of the PULPIT to every clergyman, beneficed or unbeneficed, whose names appear in the "Clergy List" for the year, and who are not already subscribers. Should any of our readers, however, know of any clergyman to whom our publication might be useful, we shall be pleased to supply a copy direct to the address sent to us, at the earliest opportunity.

OWING to the reduction in price of the PULPIT, we again call the attention of our readers to the fact, and point out that the future of this paper must, in a great measure, depend upon the energy and zeal of our present readers, in prevailing upon their friends to become subscribers.

CLERGYMEN desirous of having their Sermons pub-

lished are invited to apply to the Editor, forwarding their MSS. for his perusal.

No MSS. on any subject are ever rejected without a careful consideration of their merits.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

THIS collect is one which the reformers derived from ancient liturgies, and, as we have it, it is an exact translation of its Latin form. In it we pray that *we may escape from dangers that surround us with regard to our eternal interests*. It is of course absolutely necessary that we should start with a thorough confidence in, and reliance on God's power and willingness to protect us from those dangers, therefore in the *Invocation* we express both (1.) this confidence, and (2.) the reason for it.

(1.) O God, the Protector of all that trust in Thee. In Ps. lxxviii. we find that God is "He that giveth strength and power unto His people." He is, too (Prov. xxx. 5), a shield unto them that put their trust in Him. If we would have His help we must rely on Him, unless we do we cannot be sure of that protection, as is pointed out in Ps. xxxvii. 38, 40.

(2.) But why do we go to God for protection? our collect gives the reason, when it says, "without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy." We must try to emulate the spirit of Jehoshaphat, and say, "O God, our God, we have no might against this great company that cometh against us, neither know we what to do, but our eyes are upon Thee" (2 Chron. xx. 12). By ourselves we can do nothing, if we would conquer it must never be said of us, "This is the man that made not God his strength" (Ps. lii. 7). We must never cease to fight, but we must get our strength from God, for if we "wait upon the Lord we shall renew our strength." Thus nothing is strong without God, so, too, nothing is holy; this we can gather from John xv. 4, 5, where Christ told His disciples this very thing plainly, "He that abideth in me and I in him the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing." The Corinthians, too, were sanctified by the spirit of our God (1 Cor. vi. 11).

The remainder of this collect is the *Petition*. Increase and multiply upon us Thy mercy. We do not deserve this; we have so provoked God by continually sinning, that the very fact of His listening to us at all is a sign of His mercy; we have now, therefore, to ask for a larger display of His mercy upon us than we have had before. This was what David must have felt when he said, "O God, in the multitude of Thy mercy hear me in the truth of Thy salvation; hear me O God, for Thy loving-kindness is good; turn unto me according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies." That Thou being our ruler and guide we may so pass through things temporal, that we finally lose not the things eternal. God was the guide of Israel, and led them safely to the promised land, and in Is. xlviii. 17, we read, "I am the Lord thy God, which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go;" and again, "this God is our God for ever and ever, He will be our

guide even unto death" (Ps. xlviii. 14). But we implore God to lead us through something definite, through a temptation, and that a common one, viz., the evil influences of "the world" tending to damage our souls' health—time and eternity—the one how short, the other how long; the one how insignificant, the other how momentous, and yet time is not so unimportant when we reflect on its relation to eternity, and that there is a real danger of our so passing through the life that now is, as to lose the blessedness of the life to come. How necessary then to keep in view not "the things which are seen," but "the things which are not seen," the one being temporal, the other eternal. How important that we who are only pilgrims through this world should "look for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God" Heb. xi. 9, 10.

THE TITHE WAR IN WALES.

RECENTLY Mr. Stevens and Mr. Dale, the agents of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, left Llanfairtalhaiarn for Llansannan, accompanied by the body-guard of emergency men, a posse of police under Superintendent Vaughan, of Denbigh, and a detachment of the 9th Lancers, under Major Gough. At Llansannan a few days back the cottage occupied by Police-constable Davies was literally wrecked by an angry crowd because that officer had acted as guide to Mr. Stevens. The 9th Lancers complain of the severity of their life in camp. They are camped in a pasture field at the foot of a mountain, and during the past few days, when the rain has descended with violence, they have been compelled to sleep simply upon a shakedown of straw spread upon the grass. The life of the emergency men in camp in an adjoining field is luxurious in comparison. They have stretchers and blankets to cover them, and matting upon the ground. The police have covered the ground in their tents with waterproof on which they sleep comfortably, covered with blankets. The rations are all drawn from Rhyl, a distance of ten miles, as the people of the district maintain a vigorous boycott against the entire camp, although their animosity is mainly directed against the police. The collectors will be busily occupied for another fortnight, the first week having been entirely spent in serving distraint notices.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

MANY ancient authorities concur in the testimony that St. Paul himself preached in Britain about the year 60. In the 2nd century the British Church was fully organised. In 314, three British Bishops were present at the Council of Arles. When Augustine, the first emissary of the Roman Church, came to England in A.D. 596, he found the British Church fully established with one Archbishop and seven Bishops. Thus it is evident that the source of our Church is independent of Rome. Even Augustine did not receive his Episcopate from Rome, but from Lyons. (1.) From the first to the seventh century she may be called "The British Church," and was without a shadow of Roman influence, (2.) From the seventh to the eleventh century she may be called "The Anglo-Saxon Church." This

was not a *new* Church, but the British Church with a comparatively mild infusion of Romanism. (3.) From the eleventh to the sixteenth century she may be called the "Anglo-Romish Church." This was the same British Church, with a strong infusion of Romanism. (4.) From the sixteenth to the nineteenth century she may be called "The English Church," which, like each of the other names, does not indicate a *new* Church, but only a new state, viz., the state in which ancient British privileges had been resumed, by a thorough expulsion of Romanism in any form.—*Barrett's Questions.*

Missionary Intelligence.

AT the invitation, by circular letter and otherwise, of the Rev. Prebendary Mason, a large number of the Jews living in Birmingham attended a special service in Christ Church, Birmingham, on the evening of Trinity Sunday, when the Rev. M. Wolkenberg, the superintendent of the northern division of the society's work in England, preached an able sermon on the subject of the Trinity. It is felt that these services, which have been held occasionally for some years past, have been productive of great spiritual good both directly and indirectly.

THE Rev. J. M. Eppstein and Mr. A. Goldenberg have just concluded a fortnight's Mission to the Jews of Bristol and Clifton. Last Sunday week Mr. Eppstein preached twice in St. Paul's Church, Portland-square, on "The God of the Bible." Printed invitations were issued to the Jews to attend.

IN the C.M.S. College in Tinnevely Town, says the June number of the *Gleaner*, the Rev. H. Schaffter has been encouraged by the conversion of a young Brahmin student who had been a bitter opponent, who has already brought a wealthy friend to Christ, and has so influenced others, that quite a dozen are stated to be "trembling on the brink," and to be saying to the two first, "We come, too, if you stand fast."

FOREIGN MISSIONS.—The Œcumenical Conference on Foreign Missions was held in Exeter Hall, from the 9th to the 19th inst. Similar conferences were held in the years 1860 and 1870. All the Evangelical Societies in Great Britain engaged in foreign mission work have joined in the movement. Ninety-two representatives (including 15 ladies) have been appointed from America, and 14 delegates have been sent from the leading missionary societies in Germany and elsewhere. It is stated that the societies taking part in this have an annual income of more than £2,000,000, while the entire revenue of all Protestant missions throughout the world does not amount to £2,250,000. Special meetings for prayers for the success of the movement have been held, the principal pulpits of the metropolis being occupied by American and European delegates and well-known missionaries on the third Sunday of June. The Earl of Aberdeen is to be president, and amongst the chairmen at public meetings will be—the Earl of Northbrook, the Bishop of Exeter, General Sir Robert Phayre, K.C.B., and Sir James P. Corry, M.P. Fifty societies in England, Scotland, and Ireland directly connected with foreign missions are sending representatives, and more than fifty other societies in the

United States, in Canada, and on the Continent of Europe.

CARDINAL SIMEONI has written to Mgr. Persico, in the name of the Pope, instructing him not to leave Ireland, but to continue his efforts to collect detailed information for submission to the Holy See, respecting the condition of affairs in Ireland. In reply to some representations made through a cardinal, that the Pontiff should demand strict obedience from the Irish Catholics to the decree of the Holy Office, the Pope caused a letter to be written to the cardinal in question, observing that the Irish and their Bishops knew well what was their duty, and that any pressing injunctions of the nature indicated were uncalled for, and would be useless. Time, added his Holiness, would bring calm and reflection.

Reviews and Notices.

"DEMOCRATIC VISTAS" (Camelot Series). By Walt Whitman. London: Walter Scott, 24, Warwick Lane.

A TRULY remarkable book. The first part is occupied by an investigation of the national and individual American character, with a special allusion to its literature, all of which is made to prove the crying need of what Mr. Walt Whitman calls a "New World literature." We cannot but admire the way in which the author, obviously a patriot to the backbone, and almost extravagantly imbued with his American identity; coupled with the strongest democratic principles, unflinchingly holds out to his own people their faults and shortcomings. We quote from p. 14, line 30, &c., speaking of America, he says—"Confess that everywhere, in shop, street, church, theatre, bar-room, official chair, are pervading flippancy and vulgarity, low cunning, infidelity, even the youth puny, impudent, foppish, &c." Again, on p. 22, line 22, "America has yet morally and artistically originated nothing." The great object of "Democratic Vistas" seems to be to secure a new literature, which is described as "a literature underlying life, religious, consistent with science, handling the elements with force, with competent power, teaching and training men," p. 15, line 13. The author gives a sketch of the literature of America after some hundreds of years; this of course cannot fail to be entertaining. The concluding portion of his book is confined to short essays on special subjects, comprising an interesting account of American society, of which we gather rather a poor impression, and a very "fresh" criticism of Emerson's books. Altogether a book worth reading, not so much, we believe, as casting light on Democracy, but rather as tending to increase our information on internal American life.

"BY GOD'S HELP." Church of England Temperance Society.

THIS collection of prayers and meditations for daily use throughout the month should prove a succour and consolation to those who are pledged either to total abstinence or to observance of the rules of the general section of the Church of England Temperance

Society. Canon Ellison has written an apposite preface, and the little book is tastefully bound.

ERRATA.—In last week's Review of the "Reminiscences of William Rogers," insert *not* in line 12 from bottom of first column, page 287, after "We are"; and *schools* after "natural" in 8th line of second column. Substitute *cultivate* in 18th line for "improve." Insert of *London* after "streets" in the 29th line of same column.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

FUTURE RETRIBUTION.

SIR,—In reply to "Query," I would invite his study of pp. 189-202 of Prebendary Row's work, where the author discusses every passage in which the words *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή* occur, and shows that the various meanings of each are almost always applicable to both. They are too numerous to quote, but the following may be taken as an example. In Luke i. 46, 47—"My soul (*ψυχή*) doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit (*πνεῦμα*) hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." Mr. Row observes—"In this passage the word *ψυχή* (soul) and *πνεῦμα* (spirit) are evidently used as synonymous in meaning, each denoting the personality, including the reasoning powers and the higher affections of the mind" (p. 195).

The author finally writes as follows:—"My conclusion from the review of the above passages is, that the words *πνεῦμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul) are frequently used interchangeably to denote one and the same thing, viz., everything in man which distinguishes him from a mere animal. In one respect, however, *πνεῦμα* has a wider signification than *ψυχή*, being frequently applied to God, whereas *ψυχή* is only once so used; *πνεῦμα* is also used as the designation of evil spirits, which *ψυχή* never is. In another respect *ψυχή* has a wider signification than *πνεῦμα*, being on several occasions used to denote man's present bodily life, which *πνεῦμα* never is. It is worthy of remark that our Lord is never once represented in the Gospels as applying the word *πνεῦμα* to man, but only *ψυχή*. He once applied *πνεῦμα* to Himself, when on the cross He uttered the words "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit;" but what He there speaks of as His *πνεῦμα*, according to St. John, a day or two before, he designates as His *ψυχή*. "Now is my soul (*ψυχή*) troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save ME from this hour." It is impossible therefore to base any theory respecting the psychology of man on the use of these words in the New Testament" (pp. 202-3).

GEORGE HENSLOW.

MR. LAWRENCE'S LETTER.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words?

1. The new Canons of the Irish Church, No. 27, allow no bowing of the head except in the Nicene Creed alone.

2. Joining in the general thanksgiving was never allowed or sanctioned till revision.

3. As the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* says "its

columns are open to all schools of thought which may legitimately exist within the Church," we may conclude that it is open to no other; and that therefore all admitted may be so accounted, popish or not, unless accompanied by editorial protest.

4. Mr. Morley's "doctrine of the spiritualising of our Lord's Body," will not be denied by him, and is to be gathered from his pamphlet.

5. As to the guild in Trinity College, Dublin, every student knows of its existence. Of course there is "no display," if by that is meant marching about the courts with crosses and banner.

6. What the Divinity Professors do or can do to stem the advance they know best themselves. The late Provost said that it was "an epidemic that would pass away."

7. As to the pamphlet, "Ritualistic Progress in Dublin," every one knows the first edition was bought up in a day or two; and the second will soon have gone the same way. A leading evening Dublin paper has had a run of letters on the subject ever since the pamphlet came out. It is to be had for fourpence, post free, at any Dublin bookseller's.

INQUIRENS.

BLACK RUBRIC.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words on the 4th paragraph in Mr. Lawrence's letter of May 26th.

Speaking of a review of a pamphlet by a Mr. Morley, the writer, Mr. Lawrence, says "It (the pamphlet) states that our Lord's Body was spiritualised during the forty days, so as no longer to be bound by what is laid down in the 4th Article on the Rubric." This means, of course, that the pamphlet says that our Lord's Body is not bound by the laws which govern other bodies, that is, of not possibly being in ninety places at once. But that our Lord's Body should be so bound, as the Article and Rubric say, Mr. Lawrence laughs at as preposterous, or rather shudders at as profane. Well, the preposterousness so ridiculous, and the profaneness which makes him shudder are to be seen in the very rules as to bodies laid down in the Article and Rubric. Mr. Lawrence's words are worthy of note. "The preposterousness of ascribing to the Body of Christ, that it could be subject to rules laid down in rubrics and articles would be ludicrous, did it not rather raise in our mind an aversion to what seems to me like profanity on the part of the pamphleteer." No one says our Lord's Body is bound by our articles or rubrics—though we clergy are—but that it is bound by the *abstract laws stated in them*, to wit, that a body like ours cannot be in ninety places at once.

AUTHOR OF "RITUALISTIC PROGRESS
IN DUBLIN," &c.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this daper.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Addison, Rev. J. S., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Keighley, Yorkshire; Incumbent of St. Palladius, Drumtochty, Scotland, and Chaplain to the Laird of Drumtochty.
Allen, Rev. T. K., junior, Senior Curate of Cheltenham; Rector of St. Peter's, Dorchester.
Andrews, Rev. S. W., Rector of Claxby-cum-Normanby; Prebendary of Langfred Ecclesia in Lincoln Minster.
Atty, Rev. Robert Brunton, Rector of Nately Scures, Hants.
Barnes, Rev. William Amos, M.A., Vicar of Hurstbourne Priors, Hants.
Benham, Rev. W., Rector of St. Edmund-the-King, Lombard Street; Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.
Besly, Rev. Ernest Augustus Howard, Vicar of Skelbrooke, Yorkshire.
Bindon, Rev. Robert Holberton, Perpetual Curate of Bobbington, Stourbridge.
Bircham, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Gildersome; Vicar of St. James's, Nottingham.
Browne, Rev. A. B., Rector of Bredfield, Yorkshire.
Bruster, Rev. James, Senior Curate of St. Andrew's, Bebington, near Birkenhead; Vicar of St. James's, Gatley, near Manchester.
Burnaby, Rev. J. C. Wellesley, Curate of St. Peter's, Eaton Square; Rector of Eton, Yorkshire.
Burnham, Rev. F., Vicar of Moor-Allerton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.
Cotesworth, Rev. Gilfillan, Vicar of Aston-Cantelow, near Henley-in-Arden; Chaplain to St. Michael's Home and Assistant-Curate of Cheddar.
Evans, Rev. Leonard Henry, M.A., Vicar of Hope-under-Dinmore, Leominster.
Faithfull, Rev. Robert Colquhoun, M.A., Vicar of Quorndon, Loughborough.
Festing, Rev. John W. Rural Dean of St. Pancras and Vicar of Christ Church, Albany Street; Prebendary of Brondesbury, St. Paul's Cathedral.
Forbes, Rev. George Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Toot Baldon, Oxon.
Gardiner, Rev. F. E., Vicar of St. Paul's, Truro; Rector of Hackney.
Gillam, Rev. John, B.A., Rector of Chelsworth, Chaplain to the Marquis of Anglesey; Rector of Wiston, near Colchester.
Gurney, Rev. Edward, Tritton, Rector of Chillenden, Kent.
Herford, Rev. Percy M., Vicar of Gatley, Cheshire; Incumbent of Christ Church, Trinity, near Edinburgh.
Jones, Rev. L. T., Vicar of All Saints', Wellingborough; Chaplain to the Union, Wellingborough.
Lucas, Rev. H. H., late Wellington College Missioner, St. Peter's, Walworth; Vicar of All Saints', Battersea Park.
May, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Brenchley, Kent.
Moody, Rev. William Herbert, B.A., Vicar of Frensham, Surrey.
Robertson, Rev. Canon Scott, Vicar of Throwley; Rural Dean of Ospringe.
Robinson, Rev. Joseph Armitage, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Cambridge.
Saunders, Rev. Frederick Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Brixton, near Plymouth; Rector of Woodleigh, Kingsbridge, Devonshire.
Sandys, Rev. John Edwin, M.A., Vicar of Littlebury, Essex.
Sutton, Rev. Prebendary Robert, Vicar of Pevensy; Archdeacon of Lewes.
Walker, Rev. Arthur, Vicar of Diseworth, Leicestershire.
Ware, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Kirby Lonsdale; Canon of Carlisle Cathedral.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Clarke, Rev. Robert Lowes, M.A., Fellow, Librarian, and late Tudor, at Queen's College, Oxford, rather suddenly, on the 13th inst., aged 39.
Dalton, Rev. Cecil Wray, formerly Vicar of Grewelthorpe, at Masham, on the 14th inst., aged 82.
Mason, Rev. Richard Williams, M.A., of Plas Bodafon, Anglesey, Rector of Llantrisant, on the 2nd inst., aged 70.
Simpson, Rev. Michael Henry, B.A. Cantab, Vicar of Towlaw, county Durham, at Redcar, on the 14th inst., in his 73rd year.
Trevor, George, D.D., Canon of York and Rector of Beeford, at the Rectory, Marton-in-Cleveland, on the 18th inst., in the 80th year of his age.



The Church of England Pulpit.

EMOTION IN RELIGION.

BY THE REV. ROBERT EYTON, M.A., RECTOR
OF HOLY TRINITY, UPPER CHELSEA, AND SUB-
ALMONER TO THE QUEEN.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD, MAY 6TH, 1888.

"Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God."—ST. JOHN XX. 17.

MARY MAGDALENE, when she met our Lord after His resurrection, made a great, but, as we should say, very natural mistake. She thinks only of the joy of His recovered presence. She is like one of us welcoming back a dear friend, who was supposed, *e.g.* to be lost at sea, but suddenly re-appears. She, with her oriental habits, flings herself at His feet, and clasps them as though she would never more be separated from Him. She forgets, quite naturally, all else save that He, her rescuer from trouble, who was dead, is alive again. All the old patient teaching about the meaning of His coming, about the ultimate joy of fellowship of spirit with spirit, "the joy no man taketh from you," is forgotten. It is the earthly friend and counsellor and guide who has re-appeared; she is in an ecstasy of delight; all else has faded away; and it all seems so natural and simple that we almost resent the half-coldness of the "Touch me not." Why should He be so reserved with her and so tender to others, repel from His feet, and invite the other to reach hither his hands, and thrust them into His side, or the whole company of apostles to handle Him and see. Why does He reprove Mary for simply clasping His feet? Does He mean to remind her of old days? Is He shrinking from her touch as if she had been polluted? The answer is obvious enough to the student of the Greek Testament. The touching He rebukes is not the touch which would convince Mary of the reality of His body. The word really means take not hold of Me, *i.e.*, hold Me not, with holding that implies a wish to retain. It was a reminder of those spiritual lessons He had taught her. Do not cling to the bodily form, the merely external, but aspire to that true fellowship of spirit, which remains when you see Me no more. Do not think My regained presence is a gift and privilege for yourself, and seek to appropriate Me, but go and make known to others

Vol. XXV.—No. 653.

—all that it means, all that it involves. He would have no man know Him after the flesh, save to test the reality of His risen body; all His intercourse with others after the resurrection, was really to help them to rise to spiritual fellowship, to be true to the Master out of sight.

No doubt this special and emphatic warning given to Mary had a special meaning for her, and for all who share her peculiar temperament. The warning was given to others gradually, to her sharply and decisively. It was a warning of the special danger incidental to her case, the danger of religious excitement; of mistaking emotion for real religion. All extreme and feverish excitement was dangerous to her. Out of her had been cast seven devils, *i.e.*, she was delivered from a kind of mania, which disturbed the balance of moral as well as mental nature. Where there had been this perilous derangement any violent excitement was to be avoided. Such a temperament is peculiarly apt to relapse under some great strain of joy or sorrow, and if it relapse its last state is likely to be worse than its first. The joy of resurrection was scarcely less perilous to her than grief of the burial. Therefore it was that Christ checked her joy while He showed Himself to her before any others. He checks and moderates her joy by fixing her mind on a great spiritual truth, the new relation of man to God, by calling her to active service, giving her something to do, by compelling her to think of others rather than herself. So her emotions would run into safe channels. She would have a great thought—my Father and your Father—to relieve her self-absorption; she would have something to do for Him which would occupy her. How could He have better ministered to a mind once diseased and still open to disease; How could He have better shown a love more wise and tender and more characteristic of Himself? Surely we have a lesson here about a difficult matter certain to come before us.

1. It shows us the true method of dealing with religious movements which have a tendency to excessive emotion. Many people have no tendencies, and no dangers in that direction. They are in no kind of danger of extreme religious emotion, or, indeed, of any emotion at all. Their danger is rather in another direction. Nothing moves them, and their religion is a cold and unemotional observance of a certain fixed routine. They do their duty according to their conception of it to God and man, but duty is lit up by no fire of enthusiasm. They fall into the opposite extreme—they would never require the check—Touch me not; they would never have been at the sepulchre, their need is rather in another direction. And often they are the most severe critics of the enthusiasms and mistakes of others. Often they rush into the unenviable position of being mere critics, and going, like Balaam, from hill to hill to try to find a point from which they

may curse Israel, without endeavouring to turn the fire of enthusiasm into safer channels.

Surely our Master teaches them and all of us a lesson. No doubt there is a closer fellowship with Him than the mere clasping of His feet, which religious emotionalism represents; but it is at least further on the road to that closer fellowship than an attitude of cool indifference or cultivated criticism. His own method with Mary gives us something to think about. It was not merely the repressive method. He did not merely warn her against an exaggerated emotionalism, and leave her chilled and out of heart. He did not act as some of those who have represented Him here have done, as the official Church of England did to Wesley in last century, as, too, one must say the official element in the Church of England has done to movements in our generation—try to crush and repress her. He recognised her enthusiasm, and diverted it into a safer channel. Not merely lay not hold of me, but go to my brethren, and carry to them this wondrous announcement of a realised spiritual fellowship. Surely His method is always true; something to think about, something to do, is the corrective both with individuals and movements, for excessive emotionalism, whatever direction it takes. It is of little use to point out merely dangers when people's souls are on fire, words of warning are all very well as to all manners of excess in excessive emotionalism as well as in undue ceremonialism; but those who do nothing but warn will be listened to, as though they were tempters, with suspicion and dislike. And if even warnings are only of use when accompanied by great tenderness and largeness of allowance, what are we to say of what we find so often and so fatally in Church history, a mere policy of denunciation, which makes no attempts at understanding—which is eager to fasten upon movements a reproach and a stigma—what can we say but that of all who have incurred the awful reproach that they have made the heart of the righteous sad whom God has not made sad—none have incurred it so largely as those whose instinct is invariably to denounce before they inquire, and to caricature what they will not take the trouble to understand. Nothing makes tender hearts so hopeless, nothing chills enthusiasm so uselessly as a policy of mere denunciation; and surely what we want to do is not to increase the sum of the world's hopelessness, not to diminish its enthusiasm, but to turn it into safer channels. It is to be feared that there is growing within the Church of England a dread of emotionalism, and this needs saying just now, a disposition merely to denounce it, which may end by depriving her of a large source of influence. For there are those all around us over whose heads all ordinary appeals to reason and conscience seem to pass, but who can be brought to their highest life through appeals to their feelings; and what we have to

consider is how such persons are to be brought to live their true lives, not whether we like or dislike certain methods. Even the Salvation Army tells us roughly and loosely of a want the Church ought to supply. God forbid we should supply it by a slavish copy of their methods, but the very fact of their continued existence ought to teach us something of the inadequacy of our methods. It would be sad and hopeless to think that their disciples are capable of no higher tone of religious feeling than their present proceedings seem to testify. One of the pressing questions of the day is how we are to arouse the religious emotions and guide them in safer ways. This we shall never do by our existing Church services. It is of little use to speak in an unknown tongue now, as in St. Paul's day, unless someone interpret, and beautiful as our services and dear to us by association, they are practically in an unknown tongue to many around us. The question is always coming home to us, and it is, after preserving the faith unimpaired, the nearest question to one's heart, how is the religious motive ever to be brought to bear upon people who never enter a church, not because they are irreligious, but because the idea never seems to enter into their heads, and who even if they are galvanised by some strong influence into one, feel and look hopelessly distraught and at sea. Where is the point of contact to be found? Sometimes, and increasingly, as I have said here before, in the increased realisation of the social consequences of the life of Christ; but sometimes, also, in some strong and fervent and sustained appeal to their religious emotions.

Are we then, it might be said, to abandon our present position, the sober and well-regulated appeal to the reason and conscience, the reliance on the historic faith, for the sake of religious excitement? God forbid. It is not to abandon anything, nor to do anything to distress faithful worshippers; it is to recognise the great mass outside and its needs, to see that it needs other methods, to relax our Procrustean systems, with a view not to creating religious excitement, but of reaching those who can only be reached by their feelings. It is the preaching friar, not copied in a servile fashion from other times, adapted to the age, which we want, not to displace parochial efforts and sober work, but to supplement it, to do what it cannot do by itself. It is the insistence upon the perpetual command which all who come to Christ need to go to the brethren in some active service; it is the recognising in the widest sense that every one has a gift, and should never rest till in the widest sense he had found a ministry; it is in that insistence Christ shows us the safe method of dealing with emotionalism.

2. And to pass from dealing with bodies to individuals—the true principle is surely here—there are, there always will be, those with whom religion always takes the form of intense feeling—of feeling

that sometimes seems divided from any corresponding sense of duty. Such persons declare themselves perpetually by their language; they are full of enthusiasms for what is beautiful and artistic, what is touching and moving; they are not so keenly sensitive about what is just and what is true. They delight in religious services, or prize highly some emotional oratory of a fluent and morally unexciting type, to which the highest praise that they give is that it leaves them nothing to think about. These are the necessary settings for the jewel they prize, but often the jewel seems lost in the setting, and though it is easy to find out their preferences and the objects of their admiration, it is difficult to discover at what precise point of character and action those influences affect them; and it is often the habit of people who are more severely reasonable in their religious ideas to criticise severely, even to declare that their religion is a sham and a delusion; because it does not work this or that change in them. It is here that a wiser tone and a juster method is so requisite. Let us try to do all we can for such people, by leading them in the Christian spirit to go to their brethren, *i.e.*, to do something for them, by reminding them that the test of all Christianity is willingness to sacrifice self for others; that instead of making individual preferences a perpetual occasion of division, they should strive after mutual fellowship and rejoice in the great Revelation of common Christianity and common God, along with those who on other matters are at issue with them. But to dismiss all their feelings as sentiment, and to call it unreal, though it does not govern their whole life, is to throw them back into despair. You cannot make people reasonable in their religion, or anything else, by sneering at feeling, or by eliminating its undoubted power. Let us be aware of sensationalism by all means; it is the bane of religion, but let us give sentiment its right and just place, and let us learn to deal tenderly, as our Master did, with those who seem too much to be governed by it, to the exclusion of reason and conscience.

But if this needs to be said on one side as regards others, it cannot be too strongly urged on all who have now reached to the great and magnificent opportunities of this place, that you will not merely yield to the kind of emotionalism that comes from the religious influences around you, the solemn warnings from the past, the mediæval atmosphere with which Oxford surrounds you, but that you should here and now, by study and thought, lay the foundation of a reasonable service, and by trying to widen your sympathies, keep touch with the tendencies of your time. Beautiful buildings that tell of the past, that link one to the historic church, have a certain value, a place in one's training, an emotional influence one is glad to revive in later life, when our lines are cast amid the uninspiring dulness of modern buildings, there is an imperceptible appeal in the very air of

Oxford to the higher feelings of many natures; but it will not do to lean on that crutch to support you amidst the difficulties of the day and the problems of Nineteenth Century life. The sense of a religious halo is not religion, it may only conduce to a selfishness, and that none the less deadly because it comes under the shadowy guise of a cultivated appreciation. What men in any department of life who are to do Christ's work in their generation are needing is something much more. It is a study of Christ's life as the only revelation that can satisfy you of what God really is. This is eternal life, is life indeed, life in its intensity—to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou has sent; to learn to say the greatest prayer, hallowed be Thy name, to know a holy God revealed in Christ—this is the new foundation that will bear the shock of criticism, will survive the dilettante trifling of our day. And to gain this study in every way, intellectual and devout, is the one paramount duty of our day. This is the cure of sentimentalism, the corrective of an untamed enthusiasm, the inspiration of mere philanthropy, above all, the source and fountain of the widest sympathies, the kindest deeds, the brotherly spirit. The man who leaves Oxford with a real acquaintance with his New Testament, and a habit of devout appreciation of the secret of Christ's life, leaves it with something which will not fail him in the day of trial, even if he dwell in Mesech, or have his habitation in the tents of Kedar. Here is the secret of the religious influence, that can make wide allowances and safeguard all sentiment, that gives to some men their magic power, the thing that once learnt never leaves a man, yet it is the fruit of secret wrestlings, and longings, and hours of sustained study. Such an influence may God send forth in abundance from this place as the means of perpetuating, amid the countless opportunities of active service which life presents, the example of our Master.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR AND THE THREE CHILDREN.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM ALNWICK, INCUMBENT OF MALLERSTANG, KIRKBY STEPHEN, WEST-MORLAND.

SERMON PREACHED AT MALLERSTANG.

"Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."—DAN. iii. 18.

IT is never pleasant to a man of a conciliatory disposition of mind to oppose the opinions and wishes of others; nevertheless, it is frequently necessary to do so in the interests of truth and for the steadfast maintenance of godly principles. It would not be pleasant, as we may be sure, to the

three Hebrew youths to set themselves in opposition to the wishes of their king, but faithfulness to their God and their religious convictions compelled them to do it, and left no other course open to them. If they had yielded to their own feelings and the powerful influence brought to bear upon them, they would, no doubt, have pleased the king; but, on the other hand, they would have sacrificed the favour of their God, for what the king commanded them to do,—the God whom they worshipped and served, had forbidden them to do.

Such was the difficult position in which they were placed. It did not admit of anything like neutrality. They were completely shut up to the doing of the one or other of two things,—either to obey the king and so disobey their God, or obey their God and so disobey the king. There were three things which we can readily imagine would act upon them as a strong temptation to induce them to comply with what the king commanded.

In his royal kindness, the king had bestowed distinguished favours upon them—favours which he had not granted to other Jewish captives, perhaps as worthy as they themselves to receive them. By his royal appointment they had been carefully educated in the learning and tongue of the Chaldeans, with the view of fitting them for the honourable and responsible positions which he intended them to occupy in his kingdom. The king had also appointed them a daily provision of his own meat and the wine, which he drank, and although they declined on religious grounds to accept it, it was no less a favour granted to them on the part of the king. He had also raised them to high rank and importance in the court of Babylon. After receiving these favours from the king, and doubtless many others which are not recorded, they would certainly feel it a difficult and unpleasant task to set themselves in opposition to his wishes; yet difficult and unpleasant as it was to them, they felt that they could not do otherwise without proving themselves unfaithful to their God, and their own enlightened religious conscience. Their opposition would, no doubt, be understood by the king to mean ingratitude for the favours which he had bestowed upon them, but such a view was far from being correct. They were opposed to the king, because he commanded them to do what they knew to be contrary to the will of their God and their own conscientious convictions. It cannot be doubted that they felt sincerely grateful to the king for the great kindnesses which he had extended to them. Nor can it be doubted that they would have been glad to comply with the wishes of the king had such a thing been morally and religiously possible to them. What they were desired to do was nothing less than a wicked and sinful act which no favours bestowed upon them by the king could possibly justify. It cannot be questioned, I think, that if they had followed

their own feelings they would have fallen in with the wishes of the king, but what their own feelings of gratitude towards the king prompted them to do their own conscience told them was nothing less than a gross act of idolatry. In their case conscience was a safe guide, and it is only such so far as it speaks coincidentally with the Word of God and no further. We sometimes hear men speaking of conscience, as if it were an infallible guide in human actions, but it has no claim to be so regarded, only so far as men are led by it to live and act in agreement with the revealed will of God. Deeds of the foulest character have been perpetrated under the pretence of acting under the direction of conscience. St. Paul before his conversion, says of himself, "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." He was conscientious in what he did against Jesus Christ and his people, and because he was, he was the greater sinner. With many conscience is nothing more than mental and moral perversion. The Bible, and not conscience, is the great and infallible guide to men.

But let me observe in the next place that they would be strongly tempted to comply with the king's wishes by the example set them by others. We know that there is hardly any thing, if any thing, which is more influential, either for good or evil, than example—especially when it is the example set by an overwhelming majority, which was the case with respect to what the king of Babylon commanded to be done. It is stated in the seventh verse, "Therefore, at that time, when all the people heard the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and all kinds of music, all the people, the nations and the languages, fell down and worshipped the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up." It cannot be doubted for one moment that this example of universal conformity to what was commanded by the king would be a strong temptation to the three children—unless differently constituted to other human beings—to conform also, nevertheless, they courageously refused to do what all the rest of the people submitted to do, and thus did they carry out the direction given in their own law: "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil," as also the similar advice given by Solomon, "If sinners entice thee consent thou not." As the true and devoted servants of the Most High God they found it absolutely necessary to set their faces like flint against what the multitude did, and this is just what has been the experience of all true servants of God in every age of the world, and more especially in some periods of its history. To go in with the multitude, and to serve God as He requires us to do, are incompatibilities which do not admit of a reconciliation, "Wherefore come out from among them," says the Apostle Paul, in addressing the Christians at Corinth, "and be

ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters saith the Lord Almighty." If a man would truly serve God and save his soul alive, he must be content to be on the side of the minority, which is clearly enough taught by our blessed Lord in the seventh chapter of St. Matthew: "Enter ye in at the strait gate, for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." We do not travel to heaven in crowds, although it is not for me or any other man to presume to say who are and who are not destined to enter into it. Doubtless many will reach that bright and happy home who by human presumption were doomed to a very different destination; and perhaps many who were deemed morally and spiritually fitted for it will fail to participate in its eternal happiness and glory.

It is further to be observed that they would be strongly tempted to submit to the king's edict in consequence of the punishment which was threatened to be inflicted in case of their disobedience. The king said to them, "Now if ye be ready at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the image which I have made, well; but if ye worship not ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace." If the king thought, as he most probably did, that by so threatening Shadrack, Meshach, and Abednego, he would succeed in converting them to his idolatrous wishes, fancy, if you can, his utter surprise when he found it had no effect upon them, except to make them the more determined to hold fast their Jewish faith, and the more bold in their dissent. He would be the more astonished at their conduct, as he no doubt had found them so ready and willing to submit to his royal will in every other respect. The king would be utterly at a loss to understand their dissent, especially when he saw that they were even more resolved to maintain it in spite of his terrible threat. He did not know that their religious principles were dearer to them than life itself. Persecution is not the thing to lead men to change their opinions, even when they are erroneous, much less when they have every reason to believe that they are right and founded in truth. Under the pressure of persecution, some, I know, have yielded, not from change of opinions or change of mind, but because their courage failed them in the time of trial to stand by their opinions. But for this we should never have heard of Archbishop Cranmer's abjuration, which was undoubtedly the effect produced by the fear of a violent death, and not by any change in his mental attitude towards the truths for the holding

and teaching of which he had been seized and condemned as a heretic. In contrast with this case take that of Luther. When he stood before the Diet of Worms, and was urged by that august assembly with the direct question whether he would recant, he replied: "I cannot and will not retract anything." Persecution has, in the most diabolical ways driven vast numbers of human beings out of time into eternity; but it never did succeed in converting a single man from one class of opinions to another, for no man can be regarded as converted whose mind remains unchanged. There can be as little doubt that it has converted many an honest man into a hypocrite by compelling him to say with his lips what he did not believe in his heart. He who thinks to win another to his way of thinking by having recourse to persecution, certainly proves himself to be unwise in the selection of means, and dreadfully ignorant of the constitution of human nature. If we think a man is wrong the best thing to be done is to show him his error, and then we shall succeed in putting him right, provided he is wishful to exchange his error for truth.

But I must now pass on to notice some of the reasons which induced the three youths to take so determined a stand against the king's wishes, and by which they were enabled, with such commendable boldness and courage, to maintain their non-conformity. Their well-conditioned conscience as one reason has already been mentioned, but there are two more which I desire to bring under your notice.

They feared the infinitely great and Almighty God of heaven and earth. David speaks of some in his day who had no fear of God before their eyes, and this was the conclusion he came to from observing their wicked manner of life; but with the three Jewish captives the fear of God was a most influential principle—a principle which shaped their course of action in harmony with the revealed mind of God. They did precisely what our blessed Lord told His disciples to do, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." The fear of God raised them far above the fear of man, even such a man as was the King of Babylon, the very embodiment of absolute power so far as anything of the kind can be ascribed to a human being. It is truly said by Solomon, "The fear of man bringeth a snare." It led even Abraham, the friend of God, and the father of the faithful, twice to deny his wife, and even to tempt her to utter what was not true. When king Saul was rebuked by the prophet Samuel for not fully carrying out the commandment of God, he said, "I feared the people and obeyed their voice." Now if the three Jewish youths had feared the great and powerful Nebuchadnezzar, they would have fallen down with all the rest of

the people to worship the golden image; but having the fear of God ruling in their hearts, they were preserved from doing what they knew would have been a direct invasion of His sacred and exclusive rights. They knew that their God had said—and their fear of Him led them to practise what He had said, in spite of what the great Babylonian potentate had commanded to the contrary—"Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." They knew also that their God had said, "Thou shalt worship no other god, for the Lord whose name is jealous is a jealous God." With these positive commandments of their God before them, and ringing in their ears as it were, how could they say otherwise to the king of Babylon than: "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." Other courses were open to them, no doubt, had they chosen to accept them, but no other course than the one they followed was consistent with their religious principles and a due fear of God. Such a thing as adapting their religion to circumstances did not enter their minds. Pliability formed no part of their religion, but in spite of the most seductive circumstances, it remained inflexibly the same. They showed themselves strong where many are proved to be the subjects of a fatal moral weakness. They were not the creatures of circumstances and times. True, they could not change the circumstances in which they were placed, but then it is just as true that the circumstances in which they were placed could neither modify nor destroy their religion. How pitifully weak are the men who are just what circumstances make them, and yet this is what may be said of very many with perfect justice. Such men are one thing to-day and another to-morrow, and are quite at the mercy of circumstances as to their being right or wrong. He, however, who truly fears God will be preserved from such fickleness and instability. Of course such a man will not always be the same in his spiritual mood, which is a thing not possible in this world, constituted as it is, but one thing is certain, he will never be a trimmer, he will never be a time-server, he will never be guilty of such a thing as trying to make his religion fit into and tally with all the varying circumstances of life, and with persons of whatever type of character. He will not be slow to accommodate himself to persons and outward conditions where it can be done consistently with a due regard to religion and good morals. With him God must be pleased and satisfied in His demands, even if it should involve mortal offence to others, and bring upon him the charge of impoliteness, and even something far worse, as it has

done in the case of tens of thousands. Towards the end of the third century St. Maurice, who was the colonel of a legion called the Theban, which was composed entirely of Christians, being called on to join in idolatrous sacrifices in order to propitiate the gods, withdrew his legion to a distance from the camp. Exasperated by this, Maximian, sharer of the empire with Diocletian, ordered the legion to be decimated, and every tenth man to be put to death. This having no effect on the rest, a second decimation took place, and ultimately the whole legion was massacred. St. Maurice and his noble Christian legion would not render to Cæsar the things which belonged to God, and no man who truly fears God will do so at whatever cost.

Further and lastly, they trusted in their God, and believed that He would protect them against harm in making so determined a stand for Him against the impious edict of the king, and their trust in God was not disappointed, as we shall see. Their malicious enemies, those who felt annoyed and chagrined at the elevation of captive Jews above themselves, and ready to do anything to advance their own interests, having reported to the king their non-compliance with his command to worship the golden god which he had set up, he ordered them to be brought before him, so that he might inquire of themselves concerning the truth or otherwise of the report which had been made to him of their disobedience. When they stood before the king he said to them, "If ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace, and who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands." The reply which they made to this terrible threat shows how fully they trusted in their God to take care of them, and the more does it do so, knowing as they did that the threat would certainly be carried into execution. "Our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." Like all tyrants the king would not allow his will to be set at defiance when he had it in his power to give effect to it, therefore he commanded the three youths to be bound at once and cast into the fiery furnace, intending thereby to make short work with their persistent dissent; but their God, as they believed, delivered them out of the king's hands, for it is said in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses:—"Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astonished, and rose up in haste, and spake, and said unto his counsellors, Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O King. He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt, and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." When they

came forth from the midst of the fire at the command of the king, so complete was their deliverance that we are told in the twenty-seventh verse that "The princes, governors, captains, and the king's counsellors, being gathered together, saw these men, upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire passed on them." In their case the promise, "When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee," was made good to the very letter. Their case is also a complete confirmation of the statement made by St. Peter, "Who is he that will harm ye, if ye be followers of that which is good." And also of what is stated by Solomon, "When a man's ways please the Lord, He maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." Nothing will inspire courage like true faith in God, and there is no service so sure of an abundant reward as that which is sincerely rendered to God. A man of faith will go boldly forward when others who are destitute of it will hesitate and draw back. Those who prove themselves to be the true and valiant friends of God, He will not fail to show Himself a faithful friend to them in the time of need, "A friend that sticketh closer than a brother." On the side of God we may often find ourselves in the minority so far as numbers is concerned; but on His side we are always in the majority in the sense of possessing vastly superior strength, which is more important than mere numbers. "If God be for us," asks the Apostle Paul, "who can be against us." Faith in God makes Him our ally, and with such an alliance victory is assured to us. "In God I have put my trust; I will not fear what flesh can do unto me."

THE Rev. Thomas Fulcher, one of the oldest clergymen in the diocese of Norwich, has lately passed away. In 1824 he was ordained to the curacy of Old Buckenham, of which he afterwards became vicar, and where he was for sixty-four years. Those who knew him well could testify to his worth, his scholarship, his love of nature, especially of birds and flowers. His eyesight failed him, and a curate was appointed for the last few years, through the liberality of friends and parishioners, the income of the vicarage never being more than £100 a year. On Good Friday he was seized with paralysis, and expired on the 19th inst., in his eighty-eighth year.

A CARD.—An important discovery is announced in the *Paris Figaro* of a valuable remedy for nervous debility, physical exhaustion, and kindred complaints. The discovery was made by a missionary in Old Mexico; it saved him from a miserable existence and premature decay. The Rev. Joseph Holmes, Bloomsbury Mansions, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C., will send the prescription, free of charge, on receipt of a self-addressed stamped envelope. Mention this paper.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
 and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly **CURED** by simply using the

FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and LUNGS.
 21s. post free.
 WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had on application to

FREE OF CHARGE

Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
 52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
 Corner of Rabbion Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 30, 1888.

THE INVINCIBLE ARMADA.

IN the year 1588, three centuries ago, Philip of Spain, encouraged and assisted by the Pope of Rome, Sixtus V., attempted, by means of his so-called "INVINCIBLE ARMADA," to subjugate Protestant England to the controlling power and influence of the Pontiff. By the dispensation of the Divine, Wise, and Almighty Providence, however, His Holiness was doomed to grievous disappointment in the defeat of that *Great Armada* through the undaunted courage and bravery evinced by the defenders of our little island, which has ever since retained the title of **QUEEN OF THE SEAS.**

In order to fully understand the whole of the circumstances connected with this daring project, it will be better to consider concisely the history of our own country from the early part of the sixteenth century. The two most important events in the reign of Henry VIII. were :—(a.) The Reformation; (b.) Permitting the people to read the Bible in their own language. Henry, desiring a divorce from his first wife, Catherine of Arragon, and finding the Pope, Clement VII., disinclined to forward his wishes, acted upon the suggestion of Cranmer (a Fellow of Cambridge), and laid the case before the Universities of Europe, whose decision was in favour of the divorce greatly to the preferment of Cranmer, who was subsequently created Archbishop of Canterbury. The King further denied the Pope's supremacy, and proclaimed himself "*Head of the Reformed English Church*," granting permission to Archbishop Cranmer to have placed in every parish church in the kingdom, chained to the reading desk, a translation of the Bible by Miles Coverdale and William Tindal, so that the people might either read for themselves, or have read to them occasionally, a portion of the Scriptures in their own tongue; for Latin was the language invariably used in the service of the Roman Catholic churches, which rendered the people entirely dependent upon the priests for their religious instruction,

and unable to "search the Scriptures" for themselves. In this reign the disgraceful practice was again resorted to by the monks of selling indulgences for the purpose of raising funds to complete the erection of St. Peter's at Rome, whereby the Pope granted pardon for sin committed, however heinous the crime, to those who purchased them. "Nay! men might thus purchase a complete absolution from all crimes whatever that they might yet intend to commit. All would be pardoned, and that without the disagreeable necessity of repentance. Relatives who were groaning in purgatory might thus be set free, and 'the very moment,' said one of the indulgence-sellers, 'that the purchase-money chinks at the bottom of the strong box, these souls escape from their torments, and soar to heaven.' For the paltry sum of twelve groats, they were reminded, a man could deliver his father out of purgatory, and for eight ducats he might *commit murder* without fear of eternal retribution."

The Pope's disagreement with Henry, therefore, must have materially affected the revenue of the Romish Church; for we also find it recorded that 380 of the smallest and worst-managed monasteries, many of which were haunts of vice rather than schools of virtue, were suppressed, and their property confiscated by the Crown, the annual income from which amounted to £32,000, besides plate and jewels valued at £100,000.

When Mary, daughter of Henry and Catharine of Arragon, succeeded to the throne, Popery was restored; Cranmer, Hooper, Latimer, and Ridley being sacrificed amongst the "noble army of martyrs" in the Protestant Faith. It was as the affianced of Mary that Philip, heir to the Spanish throne, son of Charles V., Emperor of Germany, first landed in England, the marriage being celebrated at Winchester in 1554. But Mary did not long enjoy her husband's society, for although deeply attached to him, he treated her with carelessness and indifference; he was also dissatisfied with the want of deference with which his opinions were received by the English, who took little trouble to hide their dislike for him, and left Mary on succeeding to the throne of Spain the year after their marriage, never, with the exception of a few days in 1557, seeing her afterwards. He subsequently proposed for Elizabeth's hand, but she declined to marry him.

Suspicious, haughty, reserved, though patient, Philip had spies at all the principal courts of Europe, who kept him well informed of everything that was going on, even the most trivial details, and he was as well posted up in what was taking place in England and in France as though he had been there himself. A favourite saying of his was that "Time and he were a match for any other two." It was during his reign that "The Guards of Castile" were established in Spain, the first germ of a military establishment designed to maintain order and obedience at home. He was the great champion of the Roman Catholic faith, and seemed ever solicitous to display his zeal for that religion and its ministers. In one of his biographies it is narrated that, upon observing a young girl within the railing of the altar once, he told her where the priest entered was no place for her nor himself; also that a cavalier was sentenced to death for striking a canon of Toledo. These facts indicate the irresistible and unlimited awe and reverence, almost amounting to superstition, with which the Church and the priests were associated in his mind, and as a natural consequence the unrestricted power

and influence the Pope was capable of exercising over his actions.

Upon the accession of Elizabeth to the English throne Protestantism was re-established, with the supremacy of the reigning sovereign; the Prayer-book was introduced, and the authority of the Pope suppressed in Ireland. All this doubtless greatly mortified and angered His Holiness, Pope Pius V., who issued a bull of excommunication and deposition against Elizabeth. This was renewed by Pope Sixtus V., who further conferred the crown of England upon Philip of Spain to maintain as tributary and feudatory of Rome, at the same time promising to pay to Philip the sum of 1,000,000 crowns in instalments, the first of which should become due upon the landing of a Spanish army in England.

Great preparations were consequently commenced in Spain on a very extensive and extravagant scale for the invasion of our heretical island, and much anxiety must have been experienced by its inhabitants when they heard of the number of formidable ships which were being built, and, later, the amassing of an enormous army at Dunkirk (belonging to Spain at that time), under the Duke of Parma. Elizabeth, however, was too shrewd and too well advised to permit this anxiety to enervate her subjects by remaining inactive, paralysing them with fear and consternation, for in 1587 Sir Francis Drake received instructions to reconnoitre the coasts of Spain and Portugal, when he boldly attacked a number of treasure ships, appropriating their cargoes, captured and burned many of their vessels, stormed the forts on shore which interfered with his manœuvres, and finally challenged the Spanish Admiral, Santa Croce, to combat at the mouth of the Tagus; these little operations he facetiously described as "Singeing the King of Spain's beard." It is supposed that the harassment thus effected by Drake hastened the death of Santa Croce, which occurred suddenly, and the command of the Spanish fleet was entrusted to the Duke of Medina Sidonia, under whom 130 large vessels set out to invade England with 20,000 soldiers, excluding the crews, and 2,630 brass cannons; the Duke of Parma being ready to cross from Dunkirk with 40,000 more.

The Queen was very active and energetic in her preparations to repel this invasion, wisely adopting all necessary precautions suggested by her counsellors for the protection of her dominions, having her land forces concentrated at Tilbury Fort under the leadership of the Earl of Leicester, whither she rode on her white palfrey and addressed her troops, thereby greatly cheering and encouraging them; and so great was the affection and enthusiasm created in her behalf, and the terror and dismay engendered by the mere suggestion or mention of the Inquisition, that when it was found there were only thirty-six vessels of the Royal Navy, and these all of small dimensions, the nobility, merchants, and citizens generously contributed to increase the strength of the maritime defence, many of them fully equipping vessels entirely at their own expense. The fleet was stationed off Plymouth under the command of Lord Howard of Effingham, a Roman Catholic, no doubt to the deep chagrin of Philip, who had calculated upon all Catholics espousing his cause and joining him; the second in command was Sir Francis Drake as Vice-Admiral; John Hawkins being Rear-Admiral, of whom it is related that after receiving the honour of knighthood, he shook himself, and observed that his

old woman would hardly know herself when folks called her "My lady." As demonstrating the coolness, courage, and bravery of these men, a capital anecdote is related of how, while having a game of bowls, word was brought to them of the Armada having been sighted off Lizard Point, when some of the naval officers were disposed to give up their game to prepare for more serious work. "No," said Drake, "there is plenty of time for us to finish our game and beat the Spaniards afterwards." They accordingly finished the game, then prepared to meet their implacable foe, including representatives of Spain's noblest families from Arragon and Castile.

The Armada had met with very stormy weather off Cape Finisterre on first putting out to sea, which caused considerable delay in reaching sight of these shores, being compelled to steer for Corunna to repair the damage it had received. Now that it was within view, beacon fires, previously prepared for the purpose, signalled the news of its approach all along the southern coast from Land's End to the mouth of the Thames, and, as it sailed nearer and nearer in all its gorgeous pomp and splendour, so immense, so majestic, so stately appeared those vast wooden castles, that our small ships looked comparatively insignificant alongside them, upon which the proud and haughty Spaniard might fearlessly look down with ridicule and contempt. What wonder if a tremor of doubt stirred the souls of those who had to stand on the defensive and bear the brunt of the battle! But amongst those defenders were England's choicest chivalry, comprised of such men as the indomitable Drake, having stout and brave hearts of British oak, who had to fight against Popery and despotism for Protestantism and freedom.

The fighting was continued with interruptions for about twelve days, the attack being commenced on the 22nd of July by Jonas Bradbury, who opened fire at the Armada as it sailed up the English Channel in the form of a crescent, its centre well advanced, with the two horns in the rear separated from each other by a distance of about seven miles. During this first brush with the enemy the tactics of the English were to allow the centre of the crescent to pass, then to fall to and attack the flanks, which answered admirably; for, owing to the smallness and activity of the English ships, as contrasted with the bulky and unwieldy size of those of the Armada, the former caused serious damage by running alongside the other's huge structures, discharging their cannons and getting away without injury, while the fire from the latter's high decks all passed over our small vessels. It can readily be conceived that these tactics on the part of the English very soon disarranged the shape of the Spanish crescent, the admiral naturally returning to assist those of his vessels which had been attacked; at length, however, they arrived off Calais, where they anchored. Noting this, Lord Howard of Effingham had eight fire-ships prepared—besmearing them with wildfire, brimstone, pitch, and resin, charging their ordnance with bullets and stones. Having observed the Sabbath's rest, at two o'clock on Monday morning these fireships were directed down the Channel toward the Spanish fleet, and set on fire when within a short distance, producing the utmost alarm and horror, completely disorganising and demoralising the Spaniards, causing them to cut their cables in their effort to escape from these burning ships. Perceiving their disorder, the British Admiral took advantage of it, fell upon them, destroyed twelve

of their vessels, and constrained the *Invincible Armada* to the degradation of attempting an ignominious flight. They could not take the Channel course to return to Spain, as the wind and tide were against them, so they had to proceed through the Straits of Dover round by the north of Scotland, the English fleet following them closely as far as the Frith of Forth, pounding away as long as their ammunition lasted, then sending to Portsmouth for more, until, their provisions and water failing, they were compelled to give up the chase and return, having lost only one ship. Many of the vessels of the Armada, or, more correctly speaking, of what remained of that once vast navy, were wrecked in storms encountered on the coasts of the Orkney and Hebrides Islands, parts of the crews, however, being saved; some were stranded on the coast of Norway, while others were lost on the west coast of Ireland; only fifty-three shattered hulks surviving to reach their own native shores.

The "English Mercurie," consisting of a single sheet, apprising the nation of the defeat of the Spanish Armada, was the first newspaper published in England. And to commemorate the event Elizabeth caused medals to be struck representing a fleet wrecked by a tempest on one side, and the following inscription in Latin on the reverse:—"AFFLAVIT DEUS, ET DISSIPANTUR," which may be translated, "God caused the winds to blow, and they were scattered."

This, briefly, is the history of the SPANISH ARMADA, and such was its fate. And looking back upon that July, three hundred years ago; viewing with a calm, dispassionate, and unbiassed mind the cause, progress, and ostentation of that invasion; comparing the strength and equipments of the two forces, which, humanly speaking, left the victory unquestionably in favour of the invaders; who is there,—believing in a Divine Creator, and bearing in mind the casualties and disasters which befell the Spanish fleet, the concentrated wrath of the elements against the enemy, contrasted with the favourable treatment of our own navy,—what Christian will venture to dispute the proposition deduced from the result, that—"The Divine Creator Himself espoused our cause"?

Let all due honour and praise however be given to the memory of Lord Howard of Effingham and the other Roman Catholics who co-operated with him for the effective service they rendered in that year. For although there is a broader and deeper spirit of love and toleration in the present day, enabling Roman Catholics to take part in the rejoicings in commemoration of the deliverance of our island from the Spanish invaders without fear of infringing the allegiance of their conscience to the Pontiff of Rome, yet in those days it cannot be denied there was so much superstition, bigotry, intolerance, and persecution, that it must have demanded a great effort on the part of those who had been trained and brought up in the Catholic faith to have voluntarily severed themselves from the influence of their spiritual advisers, thus subjecting themselves to the dreadful retribution not only of being denied the priest's administrations while on earth, but also of being consigned, as far as the Pope and the Church were concerned, to eternal damnation.

"Love thou thy land, with love far brought
From out the storied Past, and used
Within the Present, but transfused
Thro' future time by power of thought."—TENNYSON.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST.

Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.—ST. LUKE xxii. 19 ;
ST. PAUL I COR. xi. 24.

A PAPER BY THE REV. F. TILNEY BASSETT,
M.A., PREBENDARY OF WELLS AND VICAR OF
DULVERTON.

(Continued from page 297.)

WE may now pause for an instant and compare these words with the text at the head of this paper. We need not delay on the fact that the Apostles were the representatives of the Church of the new dispensation, and to them was committed the authority to "do this." We may compare the emphatic *τοῦτο* with *τοῦτο*, which appears to be a leading and important word throughout the Eucharistic institution. In St. Luke xxii. 15 we read, "With desire I have desired to eat *τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα* with you before I suffer"; in v. 19, *τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου*; in like manner, in v. 20, *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον*; and again in *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, κ.τ.λ.* And we may here remind the reader that when the passover lamb was placed upon the table they used to say, "the body which is of the passover." This seems to be at once an echo of Ex. xii. 47, and also a link between that and the corresponding words which our Lord uttered on that occasion. But the verb *ποιεῖτε*, "*do ye*," forms an indisputable connection between the two passages, as we said above; and this is established by the words of our Lord, as reported by St. Matthew, when He sent His disciples to the goodman of the house with the message, "Where is the guest-chamber where (*ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα*) I shall *do* the Passover," etc., and further corroborated by the final words of the institution. We must therefore bend our attention to this verb. We have seen already that *עשה* is used in connection with the Passover both at the institution of that ordinance and in the other Scriptures, where its observance is narrated. We may also here add that in the LXX. all those places are rendered by *ποιεῖν*, except 2 Kings xxiii. 22, 23, where we have *ἐγενήθη*, and 2 Chron. xxxv. 18, where the translation is *ἐγένετο*. In all these places the Vulgate uses the verb *facere*, except in 2 Chron. xxxv. 19, where we read *celebratum est*. The verb *ποιεῖν* is found associated with the Passover twice in the New Testament, in the passage just quoted, St. Matt. xxvi. 18, and in Heb. xi. 28. The Vulgate has *faciam* in the former place and *celebravit* in the latter. In the Peshito Syriac the verb *בב* is found in these references, but in 2 Chron. xxx. 1, 2, 5, and xxxv. 18, 19, *בב*, *feast*, is used instead of *בב*, *passover*. And the same verb is found in St. Matthew.

Now, as in all these languages the verbs in question are of frequent use in the same general way as "to do" is with ourselves, we cannot avoid the conclusion that there is an ordinary use of these verbs, and also a phraseological or technical use of them, and it is well known to the student of Scripture that the original verb *עשה*, and its usual equivalents in Greek and Syriac, *ποιεῖν* and *בב*, and the various renderings of it in the Latin Vulgate, are found in a sacrificial and ceremonial sense. These instances abound in the Pentateuch, and pervade the Old Testament generally, appearing in such phrases as to

"do sacrifices and burnt offerings," Ex. x. 25 (the Syriac has here *בבבבבב*, *that we may sacrifice*); to "do a bullock," Ex. xxix. 36; to "do the lamb," Ex. xxix. 39. The use is so well known that, to save space, we need only refer the reader to a concordance, and he will be surprised to find the number of examples. The question, therefore, meets us, Are we to understand the verb in the passages under our consideration in its phraseological or its ordinary meaning? In other words, Is to "do the Passover" equivalent to "sacrifice the Passover," or merely to observe the ordinance and perform the enactments of the service; and, consequently, do the words in the institution of the Eucharist signify "sacrifice this," or merely "perform this"?

In seeking to find a reply to these important questions, we must examine the whole context, which lays down the laws for the observance of the Passover contained in Exodus xii. We find in this chapter the verb in question no less than nine times besides this place. In three of them it is certainly used in its ordinary sense, in four others it is most probably so, though the other meaning is possible, and in two the phraseological sense is beyond dispute. But when we remember the fact that this formula is maintained throughout Scripture, and when we compare the numberless passages where this verb is connected with sacrifice and ceremonial, there can be no doubt in the mind of any unbiassed student that the verb in the case before us is employed in its phraseological and technical meaning; and if so, it follows of necessity that the formula in the Eucharistic institution, being a quotation or reproduction of this passage, must claim for itself the same interpretation. Having proceeded thus far, we must subject the use of the word to a still closer examination. What are the scope and purport of *עשה* and its equivalent *ποιεῖν*? What does the verb really signify? Does its use in this and other sacrificial passages imply the very act of immolation, or does it only summarise the observances that pertained to sacrificial rites, the circumstances of the ceremonial in the aggregate? In perusing the context in this and other such passages where the word occurs in connection with the Passover, it is observable that the actual slaughter of the lamb is defined by a different word. In this chapter which records the institution of the rite in vv. 6 and 21, where the slaughter of the lamb is enjoined, we have the verb *שחט*, rendered in the former verse in the LXX. by the verb *σφάζειν*, and in the latter by *θύειν*, to express the act. The same verb is found in 2 Chron. xxx. 15, 17, and xxxv. 11, translated also by *θύειν*. And in Deut. xvi. 2, 4, 5, 6, the verb is *זבח*, represented in the LXX. by *θύειν*. This tends towards the conclusion that the specific act of immolating the passover lamb was expressed by other words, and that *עשה* was employed as a comprehensive term to signify the celebration of the entire rite.

Some additional light will be gained from Deut. xvi., where Moses recapitulates what may be called the rubrics for the observance of the three great annual festivals in the Hebrew calendar. In v. 1 we have the phrase under discussion, "keep (do) the Passover," *ועשית פסח*; but in v. 10 the same verb is connected with the feast of weeks, *ועשית חג שבועות*, "Thou shalt keep (do) the feast of weeks"; and in v. 13, in like manner, *חג המצות תעשה לך*, "Thou shalt observe (do) the feast of tabernacles"; and in

2 Chron. xxx. 13, the same verb is used in connection with the feast of unleavened bread. In all these places the LXX. renders it consistently by ποιεῖν.

(To be continued.)

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

THIS collect is found in Gregory's "Sacramentary," and is one of those which were retained from ancient liturgies at the Reformation. The translation of the original runs thus: "Grant us we beseech Thee, O Lord, that both the course of the world may be peaceably directed by Thy ordering that Thy Church may rejoice in tranquil devotion through our Lord."

In the collect, therefore, we pray for the peace of the Church. Grant, O Lord, that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by Thy governance that Thy Church may joyfully serve Thee in all godly quietness—the peace and tranquillity of the Church ought ever to be near the heart of each Christian, and so he would naturally take it in prayer to the throne of grace, remembering the injunction, "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls and prosperity within thy palaces (Ps. cxxii. 6, 7). Although the Church is distinct from the world, and God has promised to keep it evermore with zealous care as the "apple of His eye," yet its outward comfort and repose must be in no small degree dependant on the state of the world in the midst of which it dwells. The Christian should, therefore, seek to hasten such a time as that of which the Psalmist speaks when "God maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; when He breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder, and burneth the chariot in the fire" (Ps. xlv. 9); when, too, "God judging among the nations, and rebuking many people, they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Is. ii. 4). The Church is, and will continue in the midst of dangers and of trials, and she has, therefore, to be always on the watch and to strive that these difficulties in the midst of which she is called to exist may only strengthen her faith until her "warfare is accomplished," but in the midst of it all she may derive great comfort and consolation from the knowledge that God is overruling all, and that "He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep" (Ps. cxxi. 4), and that however much the admixture of the evil with the good may for a time dispirit the true servants of God, yet a period is coming when the righteous shall uninterruptedly "flourish" (Ps. lxxii. 7), when the "people of God shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in sure dwellings, and in quiet resting-places" (Is. xxxii. 17, 18).

THE INVINCIBLE ARMADA.

(Freely translated from Schiller.)

THEY come—they come—the foemen's haughty ships,
With clang of fetters and a faith abhorred,
And thunder on their cannons' brazen lips;—
They come to waste thy shores with fire and sword.

A floating host of fearful citadels,

Onward they sail with slow majestic motion;

INVINCIBLE their name; while scarcely swells

Beneath their mighty bulk the awe-struck ocean.

Each tempest holds his breath; a breeze unfolds

Their flags, half-imaged in the water's breast;

Death, slavery, and destruction in their holds,

They calmly glide, and sky and ocean rest.

And still that navy nears!—a tempest-cloud,

Threatening to burst on thy devoted shore.

England, thou must not fall!—the free, aloud,

Shall wail thy doom when thou art free no more.

What saved thee then? was it thy warriors, sprung

From mighty Norman chiefs that fought of old?

Was it thy Magna Charta, bravely wrung

From kings, by men that knew their rights to hold?

No! but thy God did not abandon thee

To be the prey of tyrants;—thee He cherished

To be the chosen guardian of the free;—

God, the Almighty, breathed upon the sea,

And the Armada perished.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"SCENE IN THE IRISH SYNOD."

SIR,—I observe a letter in to-day's PULPIT, signed "Inquirers." The writer makes some statements.

1. "The new canons of the Irish Church, No. 27, allow no bowing of the head except in the Nicene Creed alone." This is not correct. The thirty-seventh canon of the Irish Church (not the twenty-seventh) prescribes that in the administration of the Lord's Supper, "all acts, words, ornaments, and ceremonies other than those that are prescribed by the order in the book of Common Prayer, are hereby declared to be unlawful, and are prohibited, provided always that nothing herein contained shall be taken to prohibit the customary act of reverence when the name of our Blessed Lord is mentioned in the Nicene Creed." There is no order in the Irish Church to forbid bowing at the holy name of Jesus in reciting the Apostles' Creed, as your correspondent, copying the misstatement of the author of the scene in the Irish Synod, says.

2. "Joining in the general thanksgiving was never allowed or sanctioned till revision." This is exactly what I said in my letter in PULPIT of 16th. But it was an old practice, then, that is by our Synod, sanctioned. The pamphlet says that the practice is new, which is contrary to fact.

3. The editor of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* says, in every number, that he does not make himself responsible for contents of his correspondents' letters. The pamphlet says, in note 7, that the paper makes itself responsible for all it inserts.

4. I do not know what Mr. Morley, the author of the essay denounced in the pamphlet, thinks, but I know that the doctrine ascribed to him by your present correspondent is not in his essay.

5, 6. The existence of the guild of Ritualists in Trinity College, Dublin, is not known to every student. The existence of such a thing is doubted by many of them. It is doubted by one, who is not a student of

the College, but who knows a good deal about it. It has no overt existence as a society of which the college authorities can take notice. The attack on those authorities in the pamphlet is without ground.

7. That pamphlet (1st edition) was not sold out in a day or two; I purchased a copy of it a fortnight after its issue. Why does your correspondent tell where and at what price it can be obtained? Does he want to circulate it?

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

June 23rd, 1888.

PSYCHOLOGY.

SIR,—Mr. Henslow's reply to my questions is quite different from what I had expected. I apprehend that the error, as I esteem it to be, of Prebendary Row, is summed up in his conclusion as quoted: "*πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή* are frequently used interchangeably to denote one and the same thing, viz., everything in man which distinguishes him from a mere animal." One might expect that the use of the word animal—*anima* being Latin for *ψυχή*—might have prevented this error. Besides this, *ψυχή* is an attribute or possession of beasts as well as of men, and is so employed both in classical Greek and in the Septuagint, Genesis ix. 4 and Leviticus xvii. 14 for instance. Also, the adjectives derived from *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, so far from being interchangeable or synonymous, are set in the most strong contrast to each other in 1 Cor. xv.

I do think that the two examples quoted by Mr. Henslow are very unhappy. If the two words are synonymous in Luke i. 46, then that beautiful verse is a piece of tautology, but I see no identification between the last words of our Lord on the cross and His words in John xii. 27.

It may be correct that no theory of psychology can be based on the use of the words *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα* in the New Testament; but in view of the constant use of those words, and of the remarkable use of their adjectives by St. Paul, I cannot dismiss so summarily the theory of psychology that is the central point of Coleridge's philosophy. I do not wish to take up much of your space, therefore do not pursue the subject now.

QUERY.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Atkins, Rev. S. H., Curate of Faringdon; Rector of Dunchidcock and Shillingford, Devon.
 Bainbridge, Rev. Henry Wilkin, Perpetual Curate of St. Peter's, Everton, Liverpool.
 Baker, Rev. A., Chaplain to the *Boscawen*.
 Banner, Rev. Francis Stewart, B.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Luke's, Dunham-on-the-Hill, Cheshire.
 Bardsley, Rev. F. W., Curate of St. Luke's, Manningham; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bingley.
 Bathe, Rev. Anthony, M.A., Chaplain to St. Raphael's Convalescent Home, Torquay.
 Billing, Rev. Prebendary, Bishop-Designate of Bedford; Rector of St. Andrew Undershaft.
 Bradford, Rev. William Jocelyn, Vicar of St. Mary's, Balderstone, Rochdale.
 Burrows, Rev. F. R., M.A., formerly Master of Blackheath Proprietary School; Missioner-in-Charge of St. Barnabas, Gillingham.
 Carson, Rev. Robert B., M.A., English Chaplain at Aigle, Switzerland; Vicar of Haynes, Bedfordshire.
 Chapman, Rev. Canon, Vicar of St. Mary's, Paul's Cray, Kent.

- Cowper, Rev. Harry V. d'A., Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Mill Hill.
 Cure, Rev. Edward Capel, M.A., Vicar of Bradninch, Devonshire.
 Dawson, Rev. J., Incumbent of Trinity Church, Torquay; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Weston-super-Mare.
 Dickson, Rev. J. Phillips, M.A., Rector of Cumberworth; Vicar of Duddleston, Shropshire.
 Dixon, Rev. Sydenham L., Minister of Park Chapel, Chelsea.
 Dodd, Rev. Arthur Percy, M.A., late Curate of Weston-under-Wetherley; Vicar of Morton Morrell, Warwick.
 Evans, Rev. Canon, Archdeacon of Merioneth and Rector of Llanllechid; Rector of Aber, near Bangor.
 Farrant, Rev. John Quillin, M.A., to the Sole Charge of Steeple Gidding, Oundle.
 Feltoe, Rev. Charles Lett, M.A., Head Master of the King's School, Chester; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
 French, Rev. William, Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
 Gardner, Rev. T. J. C., Rector of Radstock, Somersetshire.
 Hall, Rev. H. Armstrong, Vicar of St. Mary's, Spring Grove.
 Knapp, Rev. William J., Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist's, Great Marlborough Street.
 Lloyd, Rev. Archdeacon, Vicar of St. Mary's, Shrewsbury; Rector of Edgmond, near Newport, Salop.
 M'Anally, Rev. Charles M., Minister of St. James's, West Hampstead.
 Mallock, Rev. J. J., Rector of Grade, Cornwall.
 Mayo, Rev. C. E., Precentor and Pricst-Associate of St. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth.
 Morgan, Rev. John Holdsworth, LL.D.; Vicar of St. Augustine's, Honor Oak; Vicar of Anslay, Warwickshire.
 Oxland, Rev. W., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Benbow*.
 Pain, Rev. Rupert William, M.A., Vicar of Dullingham, Newmarket.
 Pemberton, Rev. William Alfred, M.A., Head Master of the Grammar School, Stockport; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
 Penny, Rev. Stephen Thomas, B.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
 Phillips, Rev. John Erasmus, L.T., Rector of Trusley, Derbyshire.
 Phillips, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of Checkley-with-Hollington; Vicar of Croxden (by dispensation).
 Simpson, Rev. E. J., Douglas, M.A., Senior Curate of Whitby; Vicar of Carlton Miniott, Thirsk, Yorkshire.
 Sinden, Rev. J. F., Vicar of St. Cuthbert's, Port Elizabeth, and Priest-Associate of St. Mary's Collegiate Church.
 Singleton, Rev. Prebendary J. J., Rector of Birmingham Chesterfield; Vicar of Melbourne, Derbyshire.
 Trevor-Garrick, Rev. Frederick Stephen, M.A., Rector of Coton, Cambridge.
 Whitmarsh, Rev. A., Incumbent of St. Mary Magdalen's, Liverpool.
 Wirgman, Rev. Dr., Rural Dean of Port Elizabeth and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop; Vice-Provost of St. Mary's Collegiate College, Port Elizabeth.
 Woodard, Rev. Nathaniel, D.C.L., M.A., Rector of S. Philip's, Salford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Alington, Alan Marmaduke, M.A., late Scholar of Worcester College, Oxford, twenty-four years Rector of Benniworth, Lincolnshire, at 4, Outram-terrace, Stoke Devenport, on the 22nd inst., aged 52.
 Bruce, Rev. David, M.A., some time Vicar of Ferry Hill and Merrington, and Hon. Canon of Durham Cathedral, at 82, Lexham-gardens, Kensington, on the 24th inst., aged 77.
 Fulcher, Rev. Thomas, Curate and then Vicar of the parish for sixty-four years, at the Vicarage, Old Buckenham, Norfolk, on the 19th inst., aged 88.
 Hornby, Rev. E. J. G., at the Rectory, Bury, Lancashire, on the 19th inst., aged 72.
 Howes, Rev. Henry, Rector of the parish, at Spixworth, on the 22nd inst., aged 74.
 Woods, Rev. W. F., Curate of New Hythe, late of H.M. 17th (Leicestershire) Regiment, at New Hythe Parsonage, Larkfield, on the 18th inst., aged 45.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 028229265